DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 219 098 JC 820 310

TITLE	A Report on the General Education Model of Los Medanos College.
INSTITUTION	Los Medanos Coll., Pittsburg, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	National Endowment for the Humanities (NFAH), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	31 Mar 80
NOTE	120p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Community Colleges; *Core Curriculum; *Curriculum Development; Curriculum Evaluation; *General Education; *Interdisciplinary Approach; Program Descriptions; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

At Los Medanos College (LMC), a project was undertaken in 1978 to develop an inter- and intradisciplinary general education program that would: (1) develop among students an awareness of major social issues of the late 20th Century; (2) help them analyze social problems and inquire into the options for resolving them; (3) broaden their world view and encourage intellectual autonomy; and (4) bring a more humanistic emphasis to the general education program. The resulting model consists of three tiers. Its base consists of six required intradisciplinary courses in the fields of social science, behavioral science, physical science, biological science, language arts, and humanistic studies. Serving as capstones to these courses are two tiers of interdisciplinary courses: one deals in breadth with four or five social issues, such as energy and its implications, the limits of growth, and equality and justice; the other involves an in-depth study of one societal issue, such as racial justice or crime and violence. This descriptive report reviews the extensive planning, discussion seminars, and evaluation efforts that have been involved in the development of the model. The bulk of the report consists of appendices which include an outline of the general education model, a detailed review of the goals of the curriculum, a schedule of activities, program evaluation forms, course outlines, and program funding information. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED219098

A REPORT ON THE GENERAL EDUCATION MODEL OF LOS MEDANOS COLLEGE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John I. Carhart

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

This project was made possible through the generous support of the National Endowment for the Humanities

March 31, 1980

JC 820 310

BACKGROUND

General Education has always been the core of the curriculum at Los Medanos College. The aim of this project was to develop two tiers of interdisciplinary* courses that would serve as capstones to the whole general education (G.E.) ediface. The base of this structure consists of intradisciplinary* courses in six fields of knowledge: social science, behavioral science, physical science, biological science, language arts and humanistic studies. The capstone courses which were added interrelate learning among these fields of knowledge by involving students in an analysis of some of the major societal issues and in an ethical inquiry into the possible solutions to these problems. (See appendix A, "The Los Medanos College General Education Model" for a mid-project picture of why and how the whole G.E. model was formulated.)

In a pre-project analysis of the G.E. program at Los Medanos College (L.M.C.) the representatives from the staff and the students concluded that the following five goals were not being achieved at a satisfactory level:

1. To stimulate an acute,realistic awareness of the gravity of some of the major issues confronting this society and all of humanity in this last quarter of the Twentieth Century;

*The term interdisciplinary is used to denote relationships across fields of knowledge whereas intradisciplinary signifies relationships among related disciplines within one field of knowledge.

2. To help students analyze some of society's most crucial problems and to make an ethical inquiry into the options for resolving these problems.
3. To encourage students with a parochial outlook to develop a more adequately informed world view;
4. To encourage students to progress toward intellectual autonomy through instructor-assisted independent study;
5. To bring a more emphatically humanistic emphasis to the whole general education program.

(See Appendix B, An Elucidation of the Goals of the LMC General Education Program, for full development of these briefly stated goals.)

Those staff members and students who made the critical analysis of the G.E. program then turned toward designing this project to make sure these goals did get met. Two tiers of societal issues courses were developed and made a part of the G.E. requirement for all students (Goal 1). The instructors of these courses worked out a method of ethical inquiry and made it the modus operandi in teaching these courses (Goal 2). The students taking these societal issues courses were obliged to consider these problems in a world, as well as a local, context and to look at the options for solution in light of their worldwide ramifications (Goal 3). Although it sounds like a contradiction, students were taught how to do self-directed studies (Goal 4). And finally, the central thrust of the project was to gather faculty and students from the six areas of human knowledge and have them engage in dialogue on "what it all means"; to take knowledge from any or all disciplines and apply it to human problems; to examine how values determine perceptions and therefore, behavior; to look at knowledge with the focus being on ethics (Goal 5).

To achieve these goals a sequence of activities was projected. In the spring of 1978, even before the project was approved, a small cadre of instructors were recruited and serious planning began. Their task was to hammer out course outlines, to assemble necessary materials and to determine opening teaching strategies. In September, 1978 there were to be 4 or 5 sections of the tier 1 course offered. Also in September, 1978 the weekly professional staff development seminar was to begin. This weekly three hour seminar was to zero in on the societal issues themselves and at the same time to concern itself with learning strategies and teaching tactics----with the pedogogy of teaching this interdisciplinary, ethical inquiry into societal issues. Materials were to be searched out and consolidated into a syllabus for use in the spring semester. Planning was to begin for the tier 2 course, so they could begin to be offered in the spring semester of 1979. Finally, there was to be an end-of-semester retreat for those involved in this enterprise to hear the first soundings taken by the evaluators to assess current status, and to make future plans.

The spring semester of 1979 was to bring some new people to the G.E. cadre of instructors. Both tier 1 and tier 2 courses were to be taught. Formative evaluation was to continue. The syllabus was to be refined and updated. There was to be an end-of-year retreat for a summing up and further planning.

In the fall semester of 1979, there would be the third presentation of the tier 1 course and the second presentation of the tier 2 courses. More faculty were to be brought into the professional staff development. The seminars were to continue. The evaluators were to conclude their work and begin to write their summation.

In general, this was the plan of approach (See Appendix C for a more detailed "Schedule of Activities"). As is true of even the best laid plans, some obstacles and unforeseen problems and new opportunities arose which caused deviations but, by and large, that which was projected became, in time, that which was accomplished as will be seen in the next section of this report.

PROJECT ACTIVITIES

To effect a curricular innovation such as this G.E. model, the locus of activity is in the minds of the instructors who are going to be doing it. Not much is needed in the way of equipment or even of supplies. What is needed is a great deal of professional staff development and this takes time. Hence, the major activity of this whole project was that of professionals meeting together and talking; endlessly talking about what was to be done and how it could best be done.

During the summer of 1978 those instructors who had been recruited as participants met with the project director and the L.M.C. professional staff development facilitator for orientation and for limning out the shape of the tier 1 course, Humanistic Studies 2TG, An Ethical Inquiry Into Societal Issues. From the Pandora's Box of societal issues these five were selected for first treatment: 1) energy and its implications for ecology; 2) the limits to growth; 3) equality and justice by race; 4) equality and justice by sex and 5) the search for values as a basis for ethics. As soon as it was decided which societal issues would be addressed, a search began for current reading materials. Needless to say,

the instructors needed more background knowledge than the students so they were obliged to read at least five fold more than that selected for reproduction and give-away to the students.

In early September, before classes began, a retreat was held for last minute planning and coordination. Coordination is the word for emphasis here since the aim was to have six different instructors give their students a common learning experience. Starting then in the first week, the instructors began to meet for three hours per week in a highly structured seminar. This first cadre of instructors had the most difficult job of quickly gaining command of the basic knowledge relevent to the societal issue and, at the same time, developing the pedagogical techniques of getting it across to the students. The task was so large and so compelling that it soon took on the outsized dimensions of legend. Instructors had to abandon the security of their disciplines and venture forth into the unfamiliar role of joining the students as inquirers into complex, interdisciplinary issues. Instructors had to depend upon each other and out of this grew a cooperation and a camaraderie that went far beyond expectation and which has served to attract other instructors to this G.E. cadre.

Reproducing and then giving to the students all the required readings proved to be burdensome and expensive. In December of 1978, a special and long seminar was held in which decisions were made on what to include in a student syllabus. In January, this was completed, printed and bound together for sale to the second wave of students. This was a vast improvement over parceling out a handful of readings at a time but it still did not meet the standards of professionalism. In late spring of 1979 there was another long session on what revisions should be made in this syllabus. This time,

orientational essays and instructional materials were added to the updated readings so the finished product was a complete survival kit for the course. This revised syllabus demonstrated its worth during the fall semester of 1979 and remains unchanged for this current spring semester. However, the societal issues will change and topical subjects such as societal issues require up-to-date readings so revision of this syllabus will be an annual task.

Two outside evaluators were chosen immediately upon receipt of approval of this project. Since they were asked to do formative as well as summative evaluation, they have sat in on the planning sessions, the seminars, the retreats, everything from the first day of the project to the last. Their evaluation design called for sensing attitudes as well as collecting the kind of information that can be secured from questionnaires and interviews. For this reason they felt it important to become an intimate part of the project. Beginning with the first semester they have used the IDEA Questionnaire and a locally constructed instrument to measure student appraisal. (See Appendix D for copies of these instruments.) They also designed a questionnaire to get at faculty reaction which they used prior to follow-up interviews with faculty. At the end of fall semester, 1978, and again at the end of spring semester, 1979, the evaluators met with the participating faculty in retreats and, in a detailed fashion, discussed all of the evaluation material collected. This will happen again with this end-of-project report.

One of the consultants used in the first semester was Professor Sanford Dornbusch of Stanford University. He was such a helpful critic and was so interested in what was being attempted that he was brought back several times and then became, by mutual agreement, the overall consultant to the project. This was a very fruitful relationship for

his quick intelligence and sociological insights often allowed him to discern both pitfalls and opportunities that even the two evaluators could not see. (See Appendix E for his appraisal and recommendation on the direction for improvement of this general education model.)

The experience with other consultants was mixed. The best known and most articulate experts on the societal issues were very expensive and were difficult to book. When such consultants were brought in they could not be scheduled to meet with each class section and when any one time for a lecture was selected only a fraction of the students (and faculty) could attend. Further, the casual consultant cannot be expected to learn the uniqueness of the situation that he or she is entering. Without knowing the local context most of them proved to be slightly off-target. For example, most of the societal issues consultants disregarded the L.M.C. concern for an ethical inquiry and took hard line positions of advocacy.

Because this experience with consultants left the staff feeling ambivalent, their use as public forum speakers dwindled after the first semester. Those who were engaged in subsequent semesters' more often than not met only with the participant faculty. Almost all of these sessions became lively dialogues and, seemingly, were enjoyed, by the faculty. Even so, when asked in the abstract whether more consultants should be sought, the consensus was "no". This hard pressed faculty had to be sparing in its use of time and, apparently, feared that some of the consultants would just be diversions.

In the spring semester of 1979 the first tier 2 courses were presented. These had been approved by the staff and students sitting on General Education Societal Issues Committee (G.E.S.I.C.) as being an

in-depth probing of one of the societal issues treated in Humanistic Studies 2TG. One 3TG section in Social Science dealt with economic growth in Solano County, a 3TG in Physical Science zeroed in on energy, another 3TG in Social Science focused on racial justice and a 3TG in Humanistic Studies treated ethical issues attendant to crime and violence in the U.S. Although the outlines of these tier 2 courses must be endorsed by the G.E.S.I. Committee there is not yet a professional staff development seminar to provide the weekly criticism and planning and exchange of ideas that occurs for the tier 1 course. To be sure, the tier 2 course was supposed to give more latitute and opportunity for individual creativity for the instructor. On the other hand, this project has demonstrated beyond question that the most important determinant of success in curricular innovation is professional staff development and this is not yet being provided systematically in the 3TG courses of tier 2.

By the second semester of this project, the broad stroke outline that sufficed for getting through the fall semester had been filled in and corrected and touched up so that it provided a solid picture of the structure of the course. (See Appendix F for a formal outline of Humanistic Studies 2TG.) In addition, a very detailed outline for faculty use was prepared on each of the five societal issues. (See Appendix G for an example of the outline for the unit Energy and Ecology.) These unit outlines were developed as guides which faculty could use as they saw fit. In these unit outlines each point was collated with appropriate readings from the textual material and the now extant student syllabus as well as from background readings provided only to the faculty.

The spring semester of 1979 brought the second wave of students and an addition to the cadre of instructors. More instructors volunteered than budget provided for payment. This was an encouragement but also brought a problem in that the experienced faculty did not want to be slowed down by the level of sophistication of the newcomers. This was resolved by subdividing the seminar into a Thursday afternoon session for the new people with societal issues per se as the content and a Wednesday afternoon session for the "veterans" devoted to pedogogical problems. This has now become the format with the new group graduating after a semester of intensive study of the societal issues to a second semester of pedogogy made vital and vivid by attendance as a "master learner" in the 2TG class of one of their experienced colleagues. Thus, the new pattern is to give instructors two semesters of professional development before they take full responsibility for a Humanistic Studies 2TG class. This seems luxurious compared with the baptism of fire faced by the original cadre of instructors.

The teaching staff was not at all satisfied with the self-directed study (S.D.S.) component of this G.E. model as measured by the students' work in the first semester. The able, autonomous students turned in good projects but many students simply floundered. Long discussions on this problem were held in the pedagogy seminar. The conclusion reached was that for students unused to self-direction, freedom to follow one's own interest must be offered in a context of high structure. This sounds contradictory but it isn't. When students are told to "do your own thing" many get swamped by the myriad possibilities and by their inexperience in knowing how to go about it --- even how to begin. If, on the other hand, they are brought along step by step, A-B-C-D, most really

can follow their own bent and then surprise themselves with the quality of work they can produce. This did not become fully apparent until an efficacious process of structuring the S.D.S. projects was worked out by one or two instructors in the spring semester of 1979 and then adopted by all for use in the fall semester of 1979.

At the close of the spring semester, 1979, a day long retreat was held for a mid-project report by the evaluators, for some self-congradulations and for mapping out changes for the fall semester. It was decided not to offer any 2TG or 3TG classes during the summer since a six week session is too concentrated for the heavy load of reading and for the S.D.S. required in these courses. The only summer activity associated with this project, other than the aforementioned retreat, was a complete revision of the student syllabus. By this time there was such an accumulation of articles on these topical issues that high selectivity could be exercised picking out only the most authoritative and the most readable. An opening section on orientation (course outline, course policies, introductory explanation of ethical inquiry, etc.) was added as was a detailed section explaining the process to be followed in the self-directed study projects. This syllabus was made available in a large three-hole binder so students could easily add new reprints of articles as they were given to them.

The third and last semester of this grant project opened with a long meeting for planning. It was decided that the most experienced instructors would only meet monthly for coordination and exchange of experiences and ideas. The second group of instructors who had concentrated on the societal issues the previous spring would move to the "pedagogy" seminar and the newly recruited instructors would start the seminar on societal issues. Up to this point these seminars were led by the administrators most involved in

this G.E. project. This was modified in the fall semester of 1979 to bring in the experienced instructors as heavy contributors in both the pedagogy seminar and the societal issues seminar.

To a large extent, the fall, 1979, semester was one of continuation and consolidation. The improved 2TG and 3TG courses were taught. The professional staff development program went forward. A new group of instructors began their preparation to teach Humanistic Studies 2TG. All Instructors teaching the 2TG and 3TG courses started using the new and improved process for helping students structure their self directed studies. And, the evaluators completed the final phase of their assessment of this project.

The National Endowment for the Humanities (N.E.H.) grant terminated on December 31, 1979 but, as promised in the proposal, the project continued. The instructors who completed two semesters of preparation in the fall phased into teaching the Humanistic Studies 2TG this spring. Still another group of recruits began the spring seminar in societal issues and those now teaching the course continued in the pedagogy seminar. These two-hour weekly sessions are over and above regular load so the participating instructors are paid just as they were for the duration of the grant. This was anticipated in the 1979-1980 budget so District monies were set aside to continue that which the grant project demonstrated to be cost effective. As will be documented in the next section of this report, the evaluation of this capstone phase of the G.E. model has convinced those controlling the budget that it is a sound investment for L.M.C. hence monies will be forthcoming to continue it.

IMPACT

The general education program at Los Medanos College is required of all students who are to get the institutional endorsement of an associate in art, or associate in science degree. This then is the primary target group, but the total impact of this project will be felt by many others: the instructors who teach these societal issues courses; the other L.M.C. instructors who were vicariously influenced by this experience; the L.M.C. administrators who got new insights into how curricular innovations can be effected; the many college officials to whom progress reports and materials were sent; and, in the future, the students and instructors in other colleges which may adapt and then adopt this model.

Los Medanos College has an enrollment of ±5,000 students drawn from the industrial and farming towns of eastern Contra Costa County (See Appendix H for a full description of the community, the student body, the college and the faculty). These students are typical of community college populations. By and large, most come from the lower middle class, most come with modest educational preparation, most come quite unburdened with intellectual interests and values, and most come with a rather low level of sophistication. On the other hand they are good people, capable of learning, not too corrupted by cynicism and responsive to the notion that education (knowledge) should lead to ethical behavior. They constitute a representative group for testing a model. If this demanding program of general education can capture their minds and their commitment, then it is reasonable to assume that it could be adapted to fit almost any community college student body.

The evaluators made both an on-going and a cumulative assessment of student reactions to these capstone courses. It is an oversimplification yet an accurate summary to say that students found these to be the most difficult and the most profitable college courses they had taken. The students reported they did, in fact, become aware of the gravity of at least the 5 major societal issues presented in the course (goal #1). The instructors reported that the students had indeed struggled with the ethical implications of the possible solutions to these problems (goal #2). The work of the students reflected that they were developing a more adequately informed world view (goal #3). The instructors reported that the students self directed study (SDS) projects were frequently quality work --- much beyond expectation (goal #4). Both students and instructors reflected excitement in the use of ethical inquiry as a mode of learning (goal #5). All of these results are verified by quantitative figures from questionnaires and/or by qualitative statements from interviews in the report of the evaluators (See Appendix I, Report of Outside Evaluators on the General Education Project at Los Medanos College).

Throughout this project and continuing in the spring semester, 6 or 7 sections of Humanistic Studies 2TG, An Ethical Inquiry Into Societal Issues, have been offered day and evening each semester. In the spring semester of 1979, four sections of the 3TG courses, An Ethical Inquiry Into a Selected Societal Issue: (name of issue) were presented for the first time. Four sections were offered again in the Fall of 1979 and once again in the present spring semester of 1980. All together, there have been over 1,000 students enrolled in these two courses. This may not sound too impressive

in light of an average enrollment of 5,000 students. However, although these courses are required for the associate in arts and associate in science degrees, most community college students do not seek to graduate, hence can avoid these difficult courses. This may be corrected soon for a policy proposal is in the hopper which would make the L.M.C. general education package required for any student who wants any G.E. certification for transfer to senior colleges. This will greatly increase the number of students taking the 2TG, the 3TG and all other TG (transfer, general education) courses. An encouraging factor reported by the evaluators is that many students said they enrolled in these courses only because they were required but ended them feeling they were the most profitable courses they had taken. This message is already on the college grapevine and students are now reporting that they enrolled because they had heard good things about these courses.

Counting the current spring semester, some 22 instructors have cycled, or are cycling, through the now minimum two semesters of professional staff training. As mentioned earlier, in the first semester they read and talk endlessly about the societal issues themselves. In the second semester, the focus shifts to pedagogy---what works and what doesn't work in presenting the evidence on gravity of the problem, in considering possible options, in ethical inquiry, and in self-directed study projects. Some instructors in this second phase also sit in as "master students" in one of their colleagues' classes.

The administrators are phasing out as leaders of both of these seminars with their places being taken by the experienced instructors. This in itself is a great bonus of this project since it gets teachers

seriously talking to teachers about teaching --- a rare pheonomenon in education. It also serves to break down the needless, artificial barriers between disicplines. The novice instructors see and hear their colleague in, say, astronomy teaching successfully about equality and justice by sex. Some of the false fears about stepping outside the security of discipline are allayed. The best evidence of the success of this plan of professional staff development is the fact that recruitment of new instructors for training to teach the 2TG and 3TG courses is easy. The next best evidence is the willingness of the college to continue the seminars using scarce District monies. The N.E.H. grant ended in December, 1979 but the seminars continue, and will continue.

It is still too early to measure the impact of this project on other institutions. The fact that its existence is known throughout the nation, particularly in community college circles, is evidenced by the number of inquiries received. It is a rare week when there are less than three letters from colleges requesting description of the L.M.C. general education model and attendant materials. These have been so frequent that a kit fulfilling this standard request has been developed for mailing. Incidentally, this end-of-grant report with all appendices will be added to this kit so interested colleges will get an up-dated account of progress.

The Project Director presented papers on the L.M.C. model at two national conferences. The first was at the Danforth Foundation Conference on General and Liberal Education at Weber State College in Ogden, Utah. The second was a conference of colleges participating in Project General Education Model (G.E.M.) which was held in Washington D.C. The L.M.C. President, John I. Carhart, attended the Ogden conference and he, like

the Project Director has since corresponded with college representatives who evinced interest in the L.M.C. model.

The President is a member of the Regional Association of East Bay Colleges and Universities chaired by former U.C. Chancellor Albert Bowker. With the support of Chancellor Bowker, he tried to organize a series of conferences on general education but this bogged down in the swamps of definition of what is meant by general education. This experience added to a growing insight that some college needs to hammer out criteria of what is and what isn't general education. L.M.C. has done that to its own satisfaction for the two capstone courses to its G.E. model and in doing it raised serious questions regarding the theoretical base upon which the discipline TG courses rest. More of this in the next section of this report.

STATUS

The interdisciplinary component of the L.M.C. general education model has proved its worth to the satisfaction of the students, the administration, and the teaching staff. This is documented in the report of the outside evaluators (See Appendix I). This portion of the general education model has the enthusiastic support of the entire faculty, not just those instructors who have gone through the professional training and are now teaching these courses. The college president and his four deans are determined that this program will continue and will have the necessary budgetary support to cycle all contract instructors through the societal issues seminar and the pedagogy seminar. The District Chancellor and the District Board of Trustees have been kept informed of the progress of this innovation and have registered their approval.

As mentioned before, the seminars continue this spring semester even though the N.E.H. grant terminated as of December 31, 1979. There are seven

instructors new to this G.E. model who are currently taking the societal issues seminar and five instructors who have progressed on to the pedagogy seminar and who will be ready to enter the teaching lists next September. A serious effort has been made to encourage instructors from all disciplines to become involved. For example, of the 12 instructors now in training 3 are from the vocational technologies, two are librarians, 2 are from nursing, 2 from physical science, 1 from behavioral science, 1 from language arts and 1 from business. In addition, the 4 deans have already gone through the seminars and all remaining members of the management team will be expected to follow their lead. This has already started and will continue at a faster pace next year.

It has been the history of general education movements to become elitist, satellite programs that often engender hostility even as they succeed. Politically, they become very vulnerable and are easily shot down in budgetary wars. From the beginning, it was the strategy at Los Medanos College to make the general education program truly interdisciplinary in subject content and in teaching staff. This was not just to garner political support although it accomplished that goal. It was also done because it was believed it would make instructors better instructors and it would eventually percolate a general education flavor into all discipline courses. Evidence of that occuring is already at hand, particularly in regard to the self-directed study (SDS) and the ethical inquiry components of the model. Some instructors are beginning to require SDS projects in their discipline classes and there is increasing discussion among instructors on whether any field of knowledge can be taught ethics-free. Those instructors who have gone through the pedagogy seminar and are into using ethical inquiry as a teaching technique are beginning to refine it as a tool to be used in other teaching.

The G.E. capstone courses, whose development was the center of this project, are now required of all students who aspire to the associate in arts or associate in Science degrees. Soon, they will also be a part of the L.M.C. clearance of general education requirements for transfer to senior colleges. Together they constitute six units, three of which come from Humanistic Studies 2TG, An Ethical Inquiry Into Societal Issues, and the remaining three from one of the 3TG courses, An Ethical Inquiry Into a Selected Societal Issue:. What follows after the colon in this title stipulates the societal issue; what comes before the 3TG specifies upon which of the six areas of human knowledge the content centers i.e., Behavioral Science, Social Science, Physical Science, Biological Science, Language Arts, and Humanistic Studies. The course outlines and other materials generated for these two tiers are on file at Los Medanos College and are available upon request. As letters of inquiry are received they are sent to colleges evincing some interest.

A clarification and a point of self-criticism needs to be made here. The preparation to teach these courses has all been centered on Humanistic Studies 2TG. The back-up administrative services have gone largely to Humanistic Studies 2TG. The benefits of group critique are built into Humanistic Studies 2TG but may or may not come to the 3TG instructors. The initial assumption was that since the 3TG instructors would be drawn exclusively from the cadre of 2TG teachers there would be less need for concern for 3TG. This assumption proved not to be 100% accurate and even if it were the Project Director, the President and the Professional Development Facilitator all feel less certain that the 3TG classes are going as planned. To be sure, they continue to be rated highly by the students and teachers like to teach them but whether they may have drifted off from the

institutional purpose is not really known. The drive to follow individual will, being what it is, make the administrators of this program somewhat uneasy and makes them determined to get a better handle on the 3TG classes. They have a plan for making sure the 3TG classes do coincide with the institutional plan and it is mentioned here as an important example of the on-goingness of this whole project. Next year greater attention is going to be paid to the 3TG tier.

There is a matter of far greater concern which will be briefly outlined here. This project has concerned itself with the top two tiers of the L.M.C. general education model. It's success has served to sharpen the in-house criticism of the bottom tier. It should be remembered that the bottom tier is made up of one each of the discipline classes in the six areas of knowledge. The uncertainties and the difficulties are these: 1) consensus on criteria for what constitutes a general education course at this level has never been hammered out; 2) without agreed upon criteria how, other than by dictate, can proliferation of G.E. courses be checked?; 3) these courses are assumed to be intradisciplinary leading into the interdisciplinary Humanistic Studies 2TG and 3TG courses, but are they, and, if not, how can instructors be taught to teach discipline classes in an intradisciplinary mode?; 4) the self-directed study component should be in these courses just as it is in the 2TG and 3TG courses but experience teaches that it can not just be imposed; instructors need to learn how to entice students to seek freedom within a framework of structure; 5) the use of ethical inquiry as a teaching device, so successful in the 2TG and 3TG courses, needs to be introduced in the bottom tier courses but, again, this will take professional training for the instructors new to this mode; 6) if world view and cultural

pluralism are basic criteria for general education, as the teaching staff in 2TG and 3TG now believe, then world view and cultural pluralism should be made integral parts of these bottom tier courses.

Professor Sanford Dornbusch, the overall project consultant, met periodically with the College President, the Project Director, the Professional Development Facilitator and the two evaluators to give advice on the dynamics and direction of change. In the process, he came to be very knowledgable about all three tiers of the L.M.C. general education model. It was his assessment that, with some additional professional staff development for the 3TG courses, the top two tiers are not only operative for L.M.C. but are ready for export. However, he strongly advises that serious efforts to export be delayed until the first tier of the model be restructured. He thinks the key to the success of 2TG and 3TG tiers was professional staff development and that this faculty, primed by the current experience, could in a year or so of continued effort hammer out criteria for what constitutes general education and then apply these criteria in revising the so-called discipline courses in the bottom tier of the model. Professor Dornbusch expressed some of these views in a letter to President John Carhart, a copy of which can be found in the appendices (See Appendix E).

At this point, the staff at Los Medanos College is very satisfied with the top part of its G.E. model and is more determined than ever to restructure the bottom part of the model so the whole thing fits together with integrity and strength. To this end, L.M.C. is now in the process of writing a proposal to be submitted to the National Endowment for the Humanities for an implementation grant. If successful, the professional

staff development for this final phase will begin in the Spring semester of 1981 and will be completed by July 1 of 1982. At that point a completely revised edition of General Education: A Community College Model will be published by The Community College Press and distributed to interested colleges. In the meantime, other dissemination of what has been learned will be going forward.

Dissemination

In the section on Impact the in-process forms of dissemination were discussed. They will not be elaborated upon again here but should be listed:

1. Report on the L.M.C. general education model at the National conference for General and Liberal Education at Weber College in Ogden, Utah.
2. Report on the L.M.C. model to Project General Education Model at Washington, D.C.
3. Report on the L.M.C. model to the Regional Association of East Bay Colleges and Universities (RAEBCU).
4. Development of a kit of materials to be sent to colleges making inquiries about this G.E. model.
5. Hosting of visting delegations from other colleges.
6. Discussion of the L.M.C. model at the California Community College Association conferences.

The Project Director and the College President both feel strongly that an all-out campaign of dissemination should be postponed until corrections are made and evaluated in the bottom tier of this model. They reason that this model has the potential of making a real break-through, particularly

in community college circles. This should not be jeopardized by truncating the model and reporting only on the top two tiers or by reporting on the whole model and then glossing over the self-criticisms of the bottom tier outlined in the above section.

The plans for mid-project dissemination, in light of what has just been said, are these. This end-of grant report, complete with appendices, will be sent to the many, many colleges that have sent letters of inquiry during the last 18 months. This report will be sent to our sister colleges within the District and, needless to say, will be thoroughly discussed with the entire faculty at L.M.C. The report will be sent to the members representing the colleges and universities in the RAEBCU consortium. The full report will be sent to the presidents of the State Colleges and Universities in California who are, at this moment, struggling to re-define general education requirements throughout this system. The report will be sent to the Chancellor's office of the California Community College System, to the Executive Director of the California Community College Association, to the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, to the California universities that have graduate courses in community college education, to ERIC for inclusion in their library of community college publications, and to the League for Innovation whose function is to help spread the word on innovations in community college education. A goodly number of extra copies will be made and kept on hand for mailing to any institution making future inquiries about this G.E. model.

One last word: the administration and staff at Los Medanos College would like to acknowledge their gratitude for the financial support and the encouragement given by the National Endowment for the Humanities (See

Appendix J for a brief end-of-grant financial statement). It is not an exaggeration to say that this generous support has not only helped restructure the G.E. model but has triggered a burst of energy and optimism that has served to revitalize the whole college.

APPENDIX A

THE LOS MEDANOS COLLEGE GENERAL EDUCATION MODEL

Charles C. Collins
Dean of Language Arts and
Humanistic Studies

Los Medanos College

Presented at a conference sponsored by Project General Education Model on April 19, 1979 in Washington, D.C.

THE LOS MEDANOS COLLEGE GENERAL EDUCATION MODEL

I. Background

Those of us who have been working on the design and correction of the Los Medanos College general education model since 1972 are very admiring of what you are attempting in Project General Education Model. Believe me, we have had our problems and unlike most of you we had the tremendous advantages of 1) starting from scratch, 2) co-designing a governance model that was congruent with the curriculum, 3) having the plan, the money and the personnel for professional staff development and, maybe most important, 4) a president who was determined to make general education the hub of the curricular wheel. Any college attempting to forge a general education model without these advantages deserves profound respect--and, with or without, you certainly have ours.

Yet, I would like to offer the encouraging prediction that you will succeed more than you will fail. Our experience tells us that there are both centrifugal and centripeda' forces operating in respect to general education. The centrifugal forces, like faculty attachment to specific discipline, only make it fly apart so far before the centripedal force, centered in the imparative of an interdisciplinary approach to society's complex problems, pulls it back. I submit that that is why the notion of general education never dies. It is like Robert Hutchins said of the role of education, "Education is not much of a hope, it is just the only hope we have."

Let me give you some contextual background on Los Medanos College. We are one of the 103 public community colleges in California. We are small with a total enrollment of only 5,000 and a day enrollment of about half that figure. We are located where the San Joaquin and Sacramento rivers come together before emptying into the San Francisco Bay. The area is mostly industrial and the people in the communities are largely lower middle class in affluence and not that well off in education and culture. (I can say this with frankness and some authority since it describes my own background.) Minority students make up close to 25 percent of the student body. The women students outnumber the male students and the average age (27+) is greater than that at most graduate schools. Our hardest-working and most thoughtful students are the older women who have returned looking for enrichment of their lives. If asked, most of the students would, without hesitation, say that they came to college so they could earn more money. I mention this to dispel any illusion that

they come fired with enthusiasm for general education. As a matter of fact this whole background picture carries the message "if general education will work at Los Medanos College, it should work anywhere."

II. Philosophic Postulates, Criteria and Goals

Jack Carhart, our president, and I had the luxury of operating in sort of a think tank for a year without any faculty, students or other such realities. This resulted in opening with a fully defined structure built on a philosophic base. In looking back, it is gratifying to see how much of this has stood up to the test of time and to the genius of faculty and student criticism. I should quickly add that some of it has deservedly fallen as it faced this onslaught.

We were convinced in 1972, and are even more convinced in 1979, that everything should rest on a philosophic base; that you should know why you are doing something before and while you are doing it. Because my time before you is limited I am going to resort to the ploy used by Jefferson in writing the Declaration of Independence and simply say to you, 'We hold these truths to be self-evident..."

1. Some things are more important to learn than other things.
2. The most important things to learn are those which affect everybody and therefore should be learned by everybody.
3. The world is all of a piece. A complex world requires a complex, interconnected view of it.
4. A world view provides a frame which makes all smaller perceptions more accurate.
5. The general citizenry is capable of developing this complex view of the complex world.
6. Since knowledge, like the world, changes and grows more complex, students need to learn how to learn even more than they need to learn a body of facts.
7. Knowledge of facts is necessary but become operative only in understanding the interrelationships of the most basic of these facts.
8. It is inherent in life that the individual, the group, the society face a succession of problems which makes the end product of knowledge and thinking the action which will solve these problems.

9. The progression is from disciplinary facts to intradisciplinary understanding to interdisciplinary attacks upon complex problems.
10. These problems come to the fore or recede according to their gravity. If society's survival or human survival or planet survival is in jeopardy then every college curriculum must become a curriculum for survival.
11. Deciding on action in the solving of problems is an ethical act therefore ethical inquiry becomes a necessary part of the whole process of learning.

These may not seem like self-evident truths to you and I'll try to keep this presentation brief enough to provide time for you to challenge--and perhaps for me to rebut. For most of us, they appeared to be postulates from which we could derive these criteria for determining what should be classified as general education.

1. The subject matter should provide foundation knowledge necessary for understanding the world, the society and the culture in which people live.
2. The subject matter should encompass that content which all people need to know in order to lead self-fulfilling lives and be responsible, contributing members of the society.
3. Although all knowledge is interrelated it can, for convenience of learning, be subdivided into these major areas: physical science, biological science, social science, behavioral science, language arts and humanistic studies.
4. The content should be intradisciplinary in that any one general education course is based on the concepts, principles, attitudes and beliefs which are common to the other disciplines within that area of knowledge.
5. The content should be interdisciplinary in that it is related to all other knowledge and is basic to moving to higher and higher levels of synthesis.
6. The subject matter should provide knowledge which will directly help the student cope with a complex, changing world.
7. The knowledge to be gained should increase the options for action and thereby extend freedom of choice.
8. And, finally, the knowledge learned should lead the student easily and inevitably into consideration of the ethical implications this knowledge has for choice of action.

The goals of this general education model can [illegible]ably be captured by some words and phrases which have become part of the vocabulary of students and staff at Los Medanos College: general education requirements, generic concepts

and principles, a lean curriculum, discipline courses, intradisciplinary, interdisciplinary, self-directed study, societal issues, and ethical inquiry. Let me make these evocations of goals clearer by turning now to a description of the LMC general education model.

III. The Los Medanos College General Education Model

Any student at LMC seeking an A.A. or A.S. degree must complete a highly structured pattern of 26 units of general education. In practice, these requirements also apply to any student planning to transfer to a senior college. Hence, most students who attend for more than a course or so find themselves in these general education courses.

Of the 26 units, 20 are presented with a intradisciplinary approach to specific disciplines. The other six units come from two courses which are completely interdisciplinary. Although not true yet, we hope soon to make these two interdisciplinary courses capstones which can only be taken after the student has completed the package of 20 units of discipline courses. Before moving on, hold this big picture in mind: institutional endorsement goes only to those students who complete 26 units of highly specified general education courses, 20 of which are discipline courses but taught from an intradisciplinary approach and the remaining 6 units are made up of two courses whose content crosses all disciplines. Now let me narrow the focus to the first part of the package.

The Intradisciplinary Discipline Courses

From the beginning, the LMC policy was to have a lean, non-proliferating curriculum. We rejected completely and unequivically the idea of the so-called cafeteria-style general education. Instead, the 20 units of discipline courses which the student takes must include one course from each of these six areas of human knowledge: physical science, biological science, social science, behavioral science, language arts and humanistic studies. You may say, "But at three units each that only makes 18 units." True, but the State American Institutions requirement in California calls for 2 courses in social science. So for most students it is actually 21 units in discipline courses and if, as is usually true, the science courses have laboratories which make them four unit courses then the total may be even higher.

The prescription goes further: It isn't just any old course in the six areas of human knowledge; it has to be a course that fits the criteria of general education which I outlined earlier. In practice, the student's choice is among 3 or 4 courses within each of the six areas. For example, in the area of behavioral science the student may select the specified general education course in psychology, or sociology or anthropology. In social science the student may select the specified general education course in history or political science, or geography, or economics. In the humanities they may opt for art, or music, or literature or philosophy. And so it goes with the others. I speak for myself and not all my colleagues of LMC when I add that this is still far too permissive and that we should really have only one course in each of these six areas. More on what should be after I have finished describing what is.

I said earlier that these discipline courses are taught (or should be taught) from an intradisciplinary approach. Let me explain that. We contend that there are commonalities and overlap in the disciplines that make up each of the six areas of knowledge. There are common concepts, common principles, common theories, common beliefs, and common attitudes that disciplines within a family share. Think of the high degree of overlap among reading and composition and speech or among chemistry, astronomy and physics or among biology, ecology and health. It is part of general education to help the students see this overlap, these commonalities, these intrarelationships. If the students at this level are helped to see, even in a beginning way, that knowledge is interconnected, they will be in a much better position to bring interdisciplinary knowledge to bear on the content of the two capstone courses--and later when they have long since shaken the dust of college from their heels. Allow me to reveal my prejudice once more by saying that students in their academic innocence do not see things from a disciplinary perspective. They are taught to do so by instructors who in turn were taught to do so in their university training. I submit it is most unnatural to look at anything with such tunnel vision.

There is another general education element in these discipline courses which I should mention. Los Medanos College has never had ethnic studies nor women's studies. We saw them as largely being directed at the wrong target and as being a cop-out for the White males on the faculty. Instead, the college

policy calls for cultural pluralism to be pervasive throughout the curriculum and for ethnic perspectives and women's perspectives to be specifically included within the course outline of all courses that carry the general education label. In the case of imaginative instructors this isn't as difficult as you might think although, admittedly, it is more difficult in say physics than it is in say world literature.

The Interdisciplinary Courses

I will move now to the interdisciplinary portion of the LMC general education model. We don't think we are Cassandras in our agreeing with H.G. Wells that "Civilization is in a race between education and catastrophe." Most of us are convinced that the world faces some problems, the gravity of which have never been faced before; problems which are truly survival issues. We think it incumbent upon us to lead our students to think seriously about these societal issues. I probably don't need to name them but I will give some examples just to make sure we are thinking along the same wave length: energy and its ecological implications; the limits of economic growth; population inundation; nuclear proliferation; world pollution; the collapse of belief; alienation; ennui; leisure time and the arts; equality and justice by sex and by race--and other such demons in Pandora's Box. These then become the content of the two interdisciplinary courses.

The first of these two courses deals in breadth with four or five of these societal issues and the second course deals in depth with one societal issue. The first is called "An Ethical Inquiry Into Societal Issues" and this semester treats these: Unit 1: Energy and Its Ecological Implications, Unit 2: The Limits of Economic Growth, Unit 3: Equality and Justice by Sex, Unit 4: Equality and Justice by Race, Unit 5: The Search for Values. The second course is called "An Ethical Inquiry Into a Societal Issue: (and then the particular issue is named). This semester we have one dealing with Crime and Violence in America, another with the Limits of Growth in Solano County, and a third treating Energy.

The organizational logic used in teaching these courses follows this sort of progression: a) definitions and assertion of the problem, b) evidence of the gravity of the problem, c) first look at the ethical issues, d) the options that appear open, and finally e) the consequences and the ethical implications that follow from each option. No effort is made to teach a particular conclusion nor tout a particular ethical stance. Actually, an effort has to be made to

avoid both since instructors, in preparing to teach these societal issues, do develop strong intellectual and emotional positions and they have to guard against straight advocacy.

In both the first tier (breadth of societal issues) and the second tier (depth in one societal issue) the students are obliged to engage in a self-directed study. They are given a lot of help in learning how to learn. This is one of our educational goals and follows from the logic that if you teach people to fish they will have fish all their lives while if you just hand them some fish these will soon be consumed and that will be the end of it. Instructors have to discipline themselves to spend the class time in this self-directed study for the content of these societal issues seems to have no end and the urgency of each prompts continued attention to it. However, their self-discipline is reinforced by student evaluations for they continue to tell us that they need help in learning how to learn. At one time we also had a self-directed study component in each of the discipline courses. As a policy this was defeated by the vociferous complaint of students and faculty of being overworked. I am happy to say, however, that some discipline instructors and their students found this self-directed study (then called plural pursuits) so valuable that they have elected to keep it, policy or not.

Conditions for Success

At Los Medanos College we have been working on the design and correction of our general education model since 1972. We are not yet sure that we can label it a success (although outside evaluators and student evaluators give it rather high marks) but do think we have learned that there are some conditions that must prevail if success is to be achieved.

I have already mentioned that presidential commitment is a "must." I won't elaborate on this since it is obvious. I have also alluded to the necessity of having a governance model that is congruent with the curriculum. We thought we would be creating the work of Sisyphus for ourselves to try to move to an interdisciplinary general education with the contradiction of departments and divisions. Instead we have four deans who divide among themselves the six areas of human knowledge. I have Language Arts and Humanities, for example, while one colleague has biological and physical science, another has social science and the fourth has behavioral science. It may be of incidential interest to

add that LMC is bereft of a dean of instruction, a dean of student personnel, a dean of the evening division, and a dean of community services. The four of us are all of these as well. If you are interested in this governance model and its symbiotic relationship to curriculum you might want to read a book Jack Carhart and I wrote: Governance: A Community College Model, (Community College Press, 1977, Los Medanos College Bookstore.)

A third pre-condition for success, as we see it, is professional staff development. General education teaching is simply not discipline teaching. It is thoughtless to assume that teachers can be given a general education plan and that they will go execute it. They have to be intimately involved in the planning of it and, further, have to have institutional help in mastering the interdisciplinary content that is going to be taught. Imagine yourself a biology instructor who finds himself the teacher of a unit on The Limits of Economic Growth. Need I say more?

On second thought, I will say more. We had a grant from the U.S. Office of Education for initially developing our general education model. We thought we had professional staff development but in hindsight we can see that we had nowhere near enough and that some of our early failures (generic courses and plural pursuits) were partially attributable to insufficient professional staff development. We have now an Endowment for the Humanities grant for the revision of our model which includes the societal issues component. We are spending this money to pay faculty for attending twice-weekly seminars and occasional retreats. When grant money runs out we plan to rob from Peter to pay Paul in the college budget so we can keep this professional staff development going.

We are finding that other forms of institutional support are also needed. Finding and assembling the materials needed for new general education courses calls for the technical help of a librarian. We have found, for example that it is very valuable to have a professional librarian from our Learning Resource Center as a regular contributing member of the weekly seminars. It is like having Cousteau along when you are searching for hidden treasures in the sea.

Currently we are becoming more aware and more disturbed by the incompetency of many of our students in writing. Of course we have really known this for a long time but have become more acutely aware of it from reading the student reports on their self-directed studies and from the essay type exams which are insisted upon in these courses. Frankly, the instructors in the societal

issues courses are beginning to wonder how many of their students survive with such reading and writing deficiencies in their other courses. Be this as it may, two measures of institutional support offer some prospect of relief. Tutors who have been well trained by our Language Arts instructors are being directly assigned to the instructors teaching the societal issues courses. Those tutors will be directed, supervised and evaluated by these instructors as the tutors offer individual, person-to-person help to students with writing (and reading) deficiencies. The second measure of institutional support is along the same line but at a more professional level. Two sections of the College Writing course will be put in tandem to the societal issues sections. The writing required in the societal issues course will become the exercises in the writing class. These writing classes are organized to use the Roger Garrison one-to-one approach so what will transpire is that individual help at a professional level will be given to students as they do their writing for the societal issues course.

I wish I had more time to tell you of the false starts made and then the corrections that we have attempted. We are still a long way from being satisfied. We are conscious that the discipline courses have to some extend slipped their i<u>n</u>tradisciplinary moorings and are in strong need of professional staff development to set them aright. We know that more members of the faculty need to be brought into the cadre of general education instructors and that they are going to need preparation. We worry about the day when we no longer have grant funds to make the required extra hard work more palatable. And, we wonder what would happen if our super-supportive president were replaced by a president without this commitment to general education. But, as St. Matthew tells us, "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." We have survived and even prospered so far and we remain optomistic that we will find the engenuity and the energy and the money to continue. If indeed colleges are for survival, what other course do we have open to us?

APPENDIX B

AN ELUCIDATION OF THE GOALS OF THE L.M.C. GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

A. To Make Students Aware of Survival Issues

In the past colleges have been looked upon as institutional means by which society maintains and enhances itself. There is overwhelming evidence in this last quarter of the 20th Century to argue that maintenance and enhancement must become secondary to a much more chilling and dramatic societal goal: survival; survival of enduring values, survival of the social order, survival of humanity, survival of the earth upon which humanity abides. In varying degrees, all institutions of higher education have become aware that they are colleges for survival. The palpable imminence of the dangers has made even the timid bold. From the beginning, the faculty at Los Medanos College saw that one of its primary tasks was to help students educate themselves to cope with the world problems which put their generation and future generations in such jeopardy:

with the possibility of irreversible ecological disaster,
with the physical and psychological inundation of population,
with the clock of history ticking toward nuclear annihilation,
with the possible violent struggle over the redistribution of the world's goods,
with the failure of economic theory to give direction to a post-industrial corporate state,
with the dangers of unlimited national sovereignty in a nuclear age,
with the alienation and illnesses of the spirit,
with the erosion of credibility and faith in the democratic, or any governmental, process,

with the loss of conscience and the dimming of outrage toward evil,
with the dangers of an unbridled science and technology,
with the failure to accept a pluralism of race, of culture, of life style,
with the persistence of inequities in the matter of sexual roles and rights,
with the creation of a new morality and a new ethic to fit a changing social order.

B. To Inquire Into the Ethical Implications of Knowledge, Particularly as Applied to the Resolution of Societal Issues

It is fast becoming a commonplace observation that the world faces not a crisis in knowledge but a crisis in ethics. In most areas of concern, humanity does not suffer from a dearth of knowledge nor does new knowledge hold much promise for getting people out of the trouble they have created for themselves. Further, it does not do much good for only a few, an ethical elite, to think through the ethical implications that follow from knowledge. The big decisions on the societal issues require that most people understand the implications of knowledge concerning them even if they don't know the details of that knowledge.

Helping students see the implications of knowledge automatically involves any instructor in the issues of human values and ethics. There is no escape. As the biblical allegory warns, to partake of knowledge is to assume an awesome burden, for to know of good and evil requires that one act for good or for evil. It is difficult, if not impossible, to get off the hook. The aim, of course, is to have instructors become challengers, not advocates; to oblige their students to look squarely

at the facts, to explore the possible options for action, and to consider the ethical consequences of each option.

There are issues right in the students' community and in their lives which make discussion lively and make the general concrete. Take the issue of ecology: There is a current controversy on whether Dow Chemical should be allowed to build another vast plant on the confluence of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers. This would help to ease the high unemployment problem but would add pollution to the air and the water. The teaching tactic them becomes: interdisciplinary explication of the dimensions of the world-wide ecology problem ⟶ first brainstorming and then progressive narrowing of the options for action ⟶ value clarification using the local example ⟶ first cataloging and then discussing the ethical issues ⟶ challenging the students to do experiential learning.

C. To Develop a World View

Few really major societal issues are limited to one community, one state or even one nation. No television viewer needs to be convinced of this. But television and other popular media, helpful as they can be, have already shown that they cannot be relied upon as basic instruments for the development of a sound, rational and undistorted picture of life and problems on Spaceship Earth. The natural state, and major limitation, of relatively unsophisticated human beings is parochialism; correction of this defect is presumed to be one of the basic functions of education. Community colleges have a peculiar opportunity and obligation to contribute to this humane function, because no other segment of higher education serves a clientele marked by such variation in levels of sophistication. And no obligation has higher priority in the Los Medanos College Program of General Education.

D. To Progress Toward Intellectual Autonomy Through Self-Directed Study

Community college students as a group have been shown to register low when tested on autonomy scales. From experience, instructors can testify that these students are often those whom Erich Fromm described as seeking escape from freedom. A person learns to be autonomous, self-directive and self-responsible by having experience in autonomy. What appears to be needed is a highly structured learning experience for whose design and product the student is forced to take more and more responsibility. If this experience of autonomy within a framework of structure proves successful in the general education program then it is more likely to be adapted throughout the curriculum.

Using the vehicle of societal issues, students are pressed to make beginning efforts at autonomy in designing their own education. As they struggle, more and more of them come up with unique ways to get from where they are to where they want to be. It is particularly important that they develop responsible autonomy in their response to these broad issues that challenge all citizens in a democracy. At tier 1 and again at tier 2, each student is obliged to make, with instructor criticism, his own rational analysis of the sub-issue he selects for study and report.

Education should be a lifelong enterprise, and once out of college people have neither instructors nor texts to tell them how to make inquiry into subjects which interest them. They need to learn this process by doing it. One of the objectives of the new humanities courses is to challenge students to make a thorough investigation --- preferably a field investigation --- into some aspect of the ethical inquiry into societal issues, the substantive content of the course.

E. To Bring a Distinctively Humanistic Orientation to the Whole General Education Program

What is being done here is more than adding a specific course in humanities to the curriculum. The essence of the G.E. program is to gather faculty and students from the six areas of general education and have them engage in dialogue on "what it all means"; to take knowledge from any or all disciplines and apply it to human problems; to examine how their values are determining their perceptions and therefore, their behavior; to look at knowledge with the focus being on ethics. The present general education discipline courses in each of six areas of knowledge have been retained and have had added to them the requirement of two semester-long interdisciplinary, ethical inquiries into the great societal issues of today's world. As the college views the term, all "general education" should be informed and guided by the goals and spirit of the humanities.

APPENDIX C

PROJECTED SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES

Utilizing its own resources, the college is already forming a General Education Societal Issues Committee charged with recruiting a small cadre of teachers who will prepare themselves to offer four or five sections of the Tier I courses on what we call a "pre-pilot" basis. They will work during this spring and part of the summer preparing course outlines, assembling materials, and determining opening strategies. In all of this they will work closely with the General Education Societal Issues Committee.

In September 1978 (assuming that this grant request is accepted) a one-day retreat will be held, during which the general education instructors will consolidate the results of all of the past and present planning for the new offerings.

Subsequently in the fall the development component of the program will be fully inaugurated for the fifteen to eighteen instructors who will be centrally (with an equal number peripherally) involved in teaching the Tier I courses in the spring of 1979.

The specific activities will be:

1. Participants will begin meeting after hours and on weekend retreats.
2. Interaction with consultants (both for Societal Issues and Ethical Inquiry) will begin.
3. Teams will be formed for joint planning of courses.
4. The "pre-pilot" Tier I courses will receive input, will be subject to in-class visits, will receive formative evaluation, and will generally serve as a laboratory for this phase.
5. Those who will be teaching the three of four sections of Tier II in the spring of 1979 (Tier I is prerequisite to Tier II) will

prepare for the experimental offerings. This will parallel the "pre-pilot" preparation for Tier I in the preceding spring and summer, but with the benefit of the greater resources now available.

6. The outside evaluators, working with the Committee and the college staff, will begin the design for evaluation of the project.

In the spring of 1979:

1. The emphasis in this phase will be preparation for teaching Tier II. This will involve 15 to 20 people, some of whom are teaching Tier I and some who are not. They will meet after hours and on weekend retreats. Items (2) and (3) described for fall 1978 will now apply to this group.
2. A few "pre-pilot" sections of Tier II will be offered. They will receive on-going input and formative evaluation, will be subject to in-class visits, and will generally serve as a laboratory for this phase.
3. Participants will review, evaluate, and revise Tier I courses.
4. Formative evaluation by outside evaluators will begin.

In the fall of 1979:

1. Fully developed Tier II courses will be offered.
2. Both Tier I and Tier II courses will receive formative evaluation by participants, students, administrators, and the General Education Societal Issues Committee.
3. Outside evaluators will conclude their work and file their report.
4. The grant report will be prepared.
5. The report will be disseminated.

IDEA SURVEY FORM -- STUDENT REACTIONS TO INSTRUCTION AND COURSES

Your thoughtful answers to these questions will provide helpful information to your instructor.

• Describe the frequency of your instructor's teaching procedures, using the following code:

1 — Hardly Ever
2 — Occasionally
3 — Sometimes
4 — Frequently
5 — Almost Always

The Instructor:

1. Promoted teacher-student discussion (as opposed to mere responses to questions).
2. Found ways to help students answer their own questions.
3. Encouraged students to express themselves freely and openly.
4. Seemed enthusiastic about the subject matter.
5. Changed approaches to meet new situations.
6. Gave examinations which stressed unnecessary memorization.
7. Spoke with expressiveness and variety in tone of voice.
8. Demonstrated the importance and significance of the subject matter.
9. Made presentations which were dry and dull.
10. Made it clear how each topic fit into the course.
11. Explained the reasons for criticisms of students' academic performance.
12. Gave examination questions which were unclear.
13. Encouraged student comments even when they turned out to be incorrect or irrelevant.
14. Summarized material in a manner which aided retention.
15. Stimulated students to intellectual effort beyond that required by most courses.
16. Clearly stated the objectives of the course.
17. Explained course material clearly, and explanations were to the point.
18. Related course material to real life situations.
19. Gave examination questions which were unreasonably detailed (picky).
20. Introduced stimulating ideas about the subject.

• On each of the objectives listed below, rate the progress you have made in this course compared with that made in other courses you have taken at this college or university. In this course my progress was:

1 — Low (lowest 10 per cent of courses I have taken here)
2 — Low Average (next 20 per cent of courses)
3 — Average (middle 40 per cent of courses)
4 — High Average (next 20 percent of courses)
5 — High (highest 10 per cent of courses)

Progress on:

21. Gaining factual knowledge (terminology, classifications, methods, trends).
22. Learning fundamental principles, generalizations, or theories.
23. Learning to apply course material to improve rational thinking, problem-solving and decision making.
24. Developing specific skills, competencies and points of view needed by professionals in the field most closely related to this course.
25. Learning how professionals in this field go about the process of gaining new knowledge.
26. Developing creative capacities.
27. Developing a sense of personal responsibility (self-reliance, self-discipline).
28. Gaining a broader understanding and appreciation of intellectual-cultural activity (music, science, literature, etc.).
29. Developing skill in expressing myself orally or in writing.
30. Discovering the implications of the course material for understanding myself (interests, talents, values, etc.).

• On the next four questions, compare this course with others you have taken at this institution, using the following code:

1 — Much Less than Most Courses
2 — Less than Most
3 — About Average
4 — More than Most
5 — Much More than Most

The Course:

31. Amount of reading
32. Amount of work in other (non-reading) assignments
33. Difficulty of subject matter
34. Degree to which the course hung together (various topics and class activities were related to each other)

• Describe your attitudes toward and behavior in this course, using the following code:

1 — Definitely False
2 — More False than True
3 — In Between
4 — More True than False
5 — Definitely True

Self-rating:

35. I worked harder on this course than on most courses I have taken.
36. I had a strong desire to take this course.
37. I would like to take another course from this instructor.
38. As a result of taking this course, I have more positive feelings toward this field of study.
39. I have given thoughtful consideration to the questions on this form.

• Describe your status on the following by blackening the appropriate space on the Response Card.

A. To which sex-age group do you belong?

1 — Female, under 25
2 — Male, under 25
3 — Female, 25 or over
4 — Male, 25 or over

B. Do you consider yourself to be a full-time or a part-time student?

1 — Full-time
2 — Part-time

C. Counting the present term, for how many terms have you attended this college or university?

1 — 1 term
2 — 2 or 3
3 — 4 or 5
4 — 6 or more

D. What grade do you expect to receive in this course?

1 — A
2 — B
3 — C
4 — D or F
5 — Other

E. What is your classification?

1 — Freshman
2 — Sophomore
3 — Junior or Senior
4 — Graduate
5 — Other

F. For how many courses have you filled out this form during the present term?

1 — This is the first course
2 — 2 or 3 courses
3 — 4 or more courses

G. How well did the questions on this form permit you to describe your impressions of this instructor and course?

1 — Very well
2 — Quite well
3 — Not very well
4 — Poorly

If your instructor has extra questions, answer them in the space designated on the Response Card.

Your comments are invited on how the instructor might improve this course or teaching procedures. Use the back of the Response Card (unless otherwise directed).

Copyright © Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development in Higher Education, 1973

APPENDIX D1

LOS MEDANOS COLLEGE

Humanistic Studies 2TG
Fall 1979

To the Student:

Your responses to the following questions will be very helpful in evaluating Humanistic Studies 2TG.

Please read the questions carefully. Then circle the number in the right-hand column that best represents your opinion.

A "Comments" space is provided for each question for you to add to, or qualify, your response.

Notice that the last page asks open-ended questions. Your candid and full responses are sincerely invited.

This is an anonymous questionnaire. Do not sign your name.

Thank you,

Instructors of
Humanistic Studies 2TG

- -

Check the number of the section you are in:

- ☐ HUMST 2TG - Section 1
- ☐ HUMST 2TG - Section 2
- ☐ HUMST 2TG - Section 3
- ☐ HUMST 2TG - Section 4
- ☐ HUMST 2TG - Section 5
- ☐ HUMST 2TG - Section 80

HUMANISTIC STUDIES 2TG
Spring 1979

EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

How many units have you completed before starting this semester? ☐

How many units are you registered for this semester? ☐

PLEASE RESPOND TO QUESTIONS 1 to 8 BELOW USING THESE RESPONSES:

1 - *Definitely false*
2 - *More false than true*
3 - *In between*
4 - *More true than false*
5 - *Definitely true*

For each question, circle the number to the right that best fits your opinion.

1. I am better informed in all of the issues we have studied (energy, economic growth, equality and justice by sex, equality and justice by race and ethnicity, values) than I was before I took this course. 1 2 3 4 5 /8/

   Comments: _____

2. I am more interested in all of the issues we have studied than I was before I took this course. 1 2 3 4 5 /9/

   Comments: _____

3. I am better informed on at least one of the issues we have studied than I was before I took this course. 1 2 3 4 5 /10/

Comments: _____

4. I am more aware of the seriousness of at least one of the issues we have studied than I was before I took this course. 1 2 3 4 5 /11/

Comments: _____

5. I am more interested in at least one of the issues we studied than I was before I took this course. 1 2 3 4 5 /12/

Comments: _____

6. I have a clearer idea of the ethical considerations involved in at least some of the issues we studied than I had before taking this course. 1 2 3 4 5 /13/

Comments: _____

7. I have in some degree changed my attitude regarding at least one of the problems we have studied. 1 2 **3** 4 5 /14/

Comments: _____

_____

_____

8. I have examined my values more carefully since I have taken this course. 1 2 3 4 5 /15/

Comments: _____

_____

_____

PLEASE RESPOND TO QUESTIONS 9 to 14 BELOW USING THESE RESPONSES:

1 - ***Energy*** *and* ***Environment***
2 - ***Economic*** *Growth*
3 - ***Equality*** *and Justice* ***by Sex***
4 - ***Equality*** *and Justice* ***by Race*** *and Ethnicity*
5 - ***Search*** *for Values*

For each question, circle the number to the right that ***best fits your opinion.***

9. The unit I learned the MOST from was: 1 2 3 4 5 /16/

Comments: _____

_____

_____

10. The unit I learned the LEAST from was: 1 2 3 4 5 /17/

Comments: _____

_____

_____

11. The MOST difficult unit for me was: 1 2 3 4 5 /18/

Comments: _____

_____

_____

12. The LEAST difficult unit for me was: 1 2 3 4 5 /19/

Comments: _____

_____

_____

13. If any one of the units were to be taken out, I think it should be: 1 2 3 4 5 /20/

Comments: _____

_____

_____

14. In my opinion, the unit that dealt with the most important societal issue was: 1 2 3 4 5 /21/

Comments: _____

_____

_____

PLEASE RESPOND TO QUESTIONS 15 to 20 BELOW USING THESE RESPONSES:

1 - ***Strongly Disagree***
2 - ***Disagree***
3 - ***Neither Agree or Disagree***
4 - ***Agree***
5 - ***Strongly Agree***

For each question, circle the number to the right that best fits your opinion.

15. There should be fewer units with more in-depth treatment. 1 2 3 4 5 /22/

Comments: _____

_____

_____

16. There should be more units with less time spent on **each**. 1 2 3 4 5 /23/

Comments: _____

17. For me, the Self-Directed Study Project (SDS) has been a good learning experience. 1 2 3 4 5 /24/

Comments: _____

18. I have acquired worthwhile skills as a result of the SDS: 1 2 3 4 5 /25/

Comments: _____

19. For me, sufficient help in doing the SDS was offered by the instructor, such as skills workshops, explanations, feedback on study plans, suggestions. 1 2 3 4 5 /26/

Comments: _____

20. I expect to use the skills I learned by doing the SDS in the future. 1 2 3 4 5 /27/

Comments: _____

*Select the response to each question that most closely fits your opinion and **circle** the corresponding number to the right.*

21. Generally, the emphasis placed on the SDS was: 1 2 3 /28/

1. Too much
2. About right
3. Too little

Comments: _____

22. Generally, the reading material was 1 2 3 /29/

1. Too difficult
2. About right
3. Too easy

Comments: _____

_____

_____

23. Generally, the reading material was 1 2 3 4 /30/

1. Closely related to the topics
2. Somewhat related to the topics
3. Barely related to the topics
4. Not at all related to the topics

Comments: _____

_____

_____

24. The title of this course is, "An Ethical Inquiry Into Societal Issues." Do you feel that in each unit you did in fact look into the ethical aspects of choices for action? 1 2 3 4 5 /31/

1. Yes, too much so
2. Yes, sufficiently
3. Somewhat
4. No, not enough
5. No, not at all

Comments: _____

_____

_____

25. The claim is made that this course uses an interdisciplinary approach; that is, it uses information from many fields of knowledge. Did you find the claim to be justified? 1 2 3 4 5 /32/

1. Yes, very obviously
2. Yes
3. In some units
4. Not much
5. No

Comments: _____

_____ 50

_____

26. Answer this question if you took any of the generic courses.

How do you compare your experience in this course, Humanistic Studies 2TG, with your experience in the generic course(s) you took previously? 1 2 3 4 5 /33/

1. Much better
2. Somewhat better
3. About the same
4. Somewhat worse
5. Much worse

Comments: _____

_____

_____

Please use the space provided for your responses to the following questions. If necessary, use the reverse side of this sheet to continue a response.

27. The greatest specific benefit from taking this course was: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

28. This course could be most improved by: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

29. The greatest specific benefit from the SDS part of this course was: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

30. The Self-Directed Study part of the course could be most improved by:

31. The attitudes, practices, or policies of the instructor that enhanced my learning were:

32. The attitudes, practices or policies of the instructor that interfered with my learning were:

APPENDIX D2

LOS MEDANOS COLLEGE

Language Arts 3TG
Humanistic Studies 3TG
Physical Science 3TG
Social Science 3TG

Fall, 1979

To the Student:

Your responses to the following questions will be very helpful in evaluating the 3TG classes.

Please read the questions carefully. Then circle the number in the right-hand column that best represents your opinion.

A "Comments" space is provided for each question for you to add to, or qualify, your response.

Notice that the last page asks open-ended questions. Your candid and full responses are sincerely invited.

This is an anonymous questionnaire. Do not sign your name.

Thank you,

Instructors of
Language Arts 3TG,
Humanistic Studies 3TG,
Physical Science 3TG, and
Social Science 3TG

- -

Check the number of the section you are in:

☐ HUMST 3TG - Section 1
☐ LANGA 3TG - Section 80
☐ PHYSC 3TG - Section 1
☐ SOCSC 3TG - Section 1

STUDENT EVALUATION OF HUMANISTIC STUDIES 3TG

Spring 1979

Please respond to questions 1 to 6 below using these responses:

1. Definitely false
2. More false than true
3. In between
4. More true than false
5. Definitely true

For each item, circle the number at the right that best fits your opinion.

---

1. I am much better informed on the societal issue we have studied than I was before I took this course. 1 2 3 4 5

   Comments:

---

2. I am more interested in this issue than I was before I took this course. 1 2 3 4 5

   Comments:

---

3. I am more impressed with the seriousness of this issue than I was before I took this course. 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

4. I have a clearer idea of the ethical considerations involved in this issue than I had before taking this course. 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

5. I have in some degree changed my attitude regarding the problem we studied. 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

6. I have examined my values more carefully since I have taken this course. 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

Please respond to questions 7 to 11 below, using these responses:

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Agree
5. Strongly agree

7. For me, the Self-Directed Study (SDS) aspect of the course has been a positive learning experience. 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

8. I sharpened worthwhile skills as a result of the SDS. 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

STUDENT EVALUATION OF HUMANISTIC STUDIES 3TG

9. Sufficient help (of one kind of another) was offered me by the instructor for doing my SDS project. 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

10. My SDS experience in Humanistic Studies 2TG was of help in the course I am now taking. 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

11. I expect to use in the future the skills I have acquired in my SDS. 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

For items 12 to 17 below, circle the number to the right that most closely fits your opinion.

12. Generally, the emphasis placed on the SDS was: 1 2 3

1. Too much
2. About right
3. Too little

Comments:

13. Generally, the reading material was: 1 2 3

1. Too difficult
2. About right
3. Too easy

Comments:

14. Generally, the amount of reading material was: 1 2 3

1. Too much
2. About right
3. Too little

Comments:

15. This course is "an ethical inquiry into a societal issue." Do you feel that you did in fact look into the ethical aspects of choices for action? 1 2 3 4 5

1. Yes, too much so
2. Yes, sufficiently
3. Somewhat
4. No, not enough
5. No, not at all

Comments:

16. In your opinion, would a student benefit from taking both Humanistic Studies 2TG and 3TG even if they were not required for graduation? 1 2 3 4 5

1. Yes, definitely
2. Probably so
3. I'm not sure
4. Probably not
5. No, definitely

Comments:

17. Would you recommend Humanistic Studies 3TG to a friend? 1 2 3 4 5

1. Yes, definitely
2. Yes, with reservations
3. I'm not sure
4. Not in most cases
5. Definitely not

Comments:

Please use the space provided for your response to the following questions.

18. The greatest specific benefit from taking this course was:

19. This course could be most improved by:

20. The greatest specific benefit from the SDS part of this course was:

21. The SDS part of the course could be most improved by:

22. The attitudes, practices, policies of the instructor that enhanced by learning were:

STUDENT EVALUATION OF HUMANISTIC STUDIES 3TG

23. The attitudes, practices, policies of the instructor that hindered my learning were:

APPENDIX D3

Spring 1979

INSTRUCTOR: _____

COURSE IMPROVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INSTRUCTORS IN HUMST 2TG

---

1. What was the most difficult problem you encountered in teaching this course?

---

2. What was the second most difficult?

---

3. What was the third most difficult?

COURSE IMPROVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INSTRUCTORS IN HUMST 2TG

4. If you can suggest means for alleviating these problems, what do you suggest for problem #1?

5. For problem #2?

6. For problem #3?

COURSE IMPROVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INSTRUCTORS IN HUMST 2TG

Some of the questions which follow may, in your case, call for answers already given. Do not bother to repeat.

7. What suggestion would you make to an instructor who is handling this course for the first time, about:

   a. Stimulating responsible ethical awareness without "preaching"?

8. b. Deciding what to select for emphasis in the limited time we have?

9. c. Overcoming resistance to SDS?

10. d. Pitfalls to avoid?

11. e. Other difficulties?

12. What have been the two or three most positive aspects of your experience in teaching Humanistic Studies 2TG?

COURSE IMPROVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INSTRUCTORS IN HUMST 2TG

13. Any observer would immediately notice the extraordinary esprit de corps and atmosphere of mutual helpfulness that characterizes the group now teaching Humanistic Studies 2TG.

    a. In your opinion, how does one account for it?

14. b. How might it be perpetuated?

15. Assuming that from time to time some instructors will drop Humanistic Studies 2TG from their schedules and some will add it, should a cadre of teachers retain it year after year? If so, why?

COURSE IMPROVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INSTRUCTORS IN HUMST 2TG

16. We say much about the support LMC offers students in this course. What more help could it offer instructors?

17. Please rate the general usefulness of the weekly workshops/seminars.

- ☐ A. They have been indispensable to the success of the course.
- ☐ B. They have been very helpful.
- ☐ C. They have been helpful.
- ☐ D. I have mixed feelings about them.
- ☐ E. The time could have been better used in other ways.

Qualifications:

18. What suggestions have you for improving the workshop/seminars?

19. Should the units of Humanistic Studies 2TG be changed periodically? If so,

a. How frequently?

b. How many units at a time?

20. Is the number of units now taught about right?

21. Should our experience with outside speakers this semester encourage us to continue the practice?

22. Please comment on the unit outlines; check more than one box if appropriate.

- ☐ A. They have been very helpful.
- ☐ B. They have helped provide unity for the course.
- ☐ C. Some were more helpful than others.
- ☐ D. They were mostly unnecessary.
- ☐ E. Use of them was too constraining.

Comments:

23. Is it likely that the teaching of this course will affect your teaching in other courses. If so, could you indicate in what ways?

24. What benefits, if any, might other aspects of the LMC curriculum derive from the General Education Societal Issues program?

25. Have you any suggestions as to what might best be done to secure these benefits?

COURSE IMPROVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INSTRUCTORS IN HUMST 2TG

26. In our grant proposal to the National Endowment for the Humanities we set forth five main goals for our General Education Societal Issues program. To what extent do you believe each of these goals has been achieved in your section?

Goals:

1. To make students aware of survival issues
2. To inquire into the ethical implications of knowledge, particularly as applied to the resolution of societal issues
3. To develop a world view
4. To progress toward intellectual autonomy through self-directed study
5. To bring a distinctively humanistic orientation to this aspect of the general education program.

Degree of Achievement:

A. Surprisingly well
B. Reasonably well, considering the limitations of time, student aptitude, "first attempt," etc.
C. Not disappointing, but not really reassuring, either
D. Poorly, little or no progress
E. Too difficult to assess.

GOAL	DEGREE OF ACHIEVEMENT					COMMENTS
	A	B	C	D	E	
1						
2						

COURSE IMPROVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INSTRUCTORS IN HUMST 2TG

GOAL	DEGREE OF ACHIEVEMENT					COMMENTS
	A	B	C	D	E	
3						
4						
5						

27. Do you have any other comments that would aid in the evaluation of the GESI effort this year?

APPENDIX D4

Spring 1979

INSTRUCTOR: _____

COURSE IMPROVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INSTRUCTORS IN HUMST 3TG

---

1. What was the most difficult problem you encountered in teaching this course?

---

2. What was the second most difficult?

---

3. What was the third most difficult?

COURSE IMPROVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INSTRUCTORS IN HUMST 3TG

4. If you can suggest means for alleviating these problems, what do you suggest for problem #1?

5. For problem #2?

6. For problem #3?

COURSE IMPROVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INSTRUCTORS IN HUMST 3TG

Some of the questions which follow may, in your case, call for answers already given. Do not bother to repeat.

7. What suggestion would you make to an instructor who is handling this course for the first time, about:

   a. Stimulating responsible ethical awareness without "preaching"?

8. b. Relating this course to Humanistic Studies 2TG

9. c. Overcoming resistance to SDS?

COURSE IMPROVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INSTRUCTORS IN HUMST 3TG

10. d. Pitfalls to avoid?

11. e. Other difficulties?

12. What have been the two or three most positive aspects of your experience in teaching Humanistic Studies 3TG?

COURSE IMPROVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INSTRUCTORS IN HUMST 3TG

13. Any observer would immediately notice the extraordinary esprit de corps and atmosphere of mutual helpfulness that characterizes the group now teaching Humanistic Studies 2TG and 3TG.

    a. In your opinion, how does one account for it?

14. b. How might it be perpetuated?

15. Assuming that from time to time some instructors will drop Humanistic Studies 2TG or Humanistic Studies 3TG from their schedules and some will add it, should a cadre of teachers retain it year after year? If so, why?

COURSE IMPROVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INSTRUCTORS IN HUMST 3TG

16. We say much about the support LMC offers students in this course. What more help could it offer instructors?

17. Please rate the general usefulness of the weekly workshops/seminars.

☐ A. They have been indispensable to the success of the course.

☐ B. They have been very helpful.

☐ C. They have been helpful.

☐ D. I have mixed feelings about them.

☐ E. The time could have been better used in other ways.

Qualifications:

18. What suggestions have you for improving the workshop/seminars?

19. Should the units of Humanistic Studies 2TG be changed periodically? If so,

    a. How frequently?

    b. How many units at a time?

20. Is the number of units now taught about right?

21. Should our experience with outside speakers this semester encourage us to continue the practice?

22. Do you see advantages to arranging the seminars this fall in such a way that they serve the interests both of those who teach 2TG and 3TG?

23. Is it likely that the teaching of this course will affect your teaching in other courses. If so, could you indicate in what ways?

24. What benefits, if any, might other aspects of the LMC curriculum derive from the General Education Societal Issues program?

25. Have you any suggestions as to what might best be done to secure these benefits?

COURSE IMPROVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INSTRUCTORS IN HUMST 3TG

26. In our grant proposal to the National Endowment for the Humanities we set forth five main goals for our General Education Societal Issues program. To what extent do you believe each of these goals has been achieved in your section?

Goals:

1. To make students aware of survival issues
2. To inquire into the ethical implications of knowledge, particularly as applied to the resolution of societal issues
3. To develop a world view
4. To progress toward intellectual autonomy through self-directed study
5. To bring a distinctively humanistic orientation to this aspect of the general education program.

Degree of Achievement:

A. Surprisingly well
B. Reasonably well, considering the limitations of time, student aptitude, "first attempt," etc.
C. Not disappointing, but not really reassuring, either
D. Poorly, little or no progress
E. Too difficult to assess.

GOAL	DEGREE OF ACHIEVEMENT					COMMENTS
	A	B	C	D	E	
1						
2						

COURSE IMPROVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INSTRUCTORS IN HUMST 3TG

GOAL	DEGREE OF ACHIEVEMENT					COMMENTS
	A	B	C	D	E	
3						
4						
5						

COURSE IMPROVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INSTRUCTORS IN HUMST 3TG

27. Do you have any other comments that would aid in the evaluation of the GESI effort this year?

APPENDIX E

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305

March 20, 1980

SANFORD M. DORNBUSCH
REED-HODGSON PROFESSOR OF HUMAN BIOLOGY
AND PROFESSOR OF SOCIOLOGY AND EDUCATION

John I. Carhart, President
Los Medanos College
2700 Leland Road
Pittsburg, California 94565

Dear President Carhart:

The more I have learned about General Education at Los Medanos College, the more I have been impressed by the combination of long-term vision and short-term practicality demonstrated by you and your colleagues. Los Medanos is being increasingly recognized as a leader in the development of general education within the community college movement.

You and your staff have accomplished so much in the development of interdisciplinary courses that lead students to think about major societal issues and their personal relevance. How has this been accomplished? First, there has been strong intellectual leadership from the central administrators. That intellectual thrust has been sustained through recent years and has buttressed the activities of the faculty. Second, the teachers in the interdisciplianry courses have developed an esprit de corps that is in part a reflection of their increasing mastery of complex new material. Third, the curriculum has not been frozen. As teachers and students provided constructive feedback, both positive and negative, the course materials have been changed to take their evaluations into account. Fourth, administrators and faculty have recognized together the importance of staff development in order to meet the challenges of a novel curriculum. This openness to change has been all too rare in American education. The evaluation results indicate that a community college faculty need not consider its own education finished at the end of graduate training; indeed, there can be positive self-images as teachers learn to transcend the limitations of their own specific training.

That leads to the current proposal, which I heartily endorse. The same spirit of administrative-faculty cooperation in staff development and course evaluation can be employed to examine and improve the intra-disciplinary general education courses at Los Medanos. Schools pay lip service to general education by serving a smorgasbord of unrelated courses. In part, this arises because the politic approach to general education is to avoid examining the nature of the task, and certainly to avoid looking at specific courses and content. The administration, in fact, at Los Medanos are displaying an encouraging willingness to develop criteria that can be applied to general education in other institutions (a truly exportable commodity) and to apply those criteria to their own activities.

Of course, reaching these laudable goals will require sustained commitment and continuing staff development. The job is definitely worth doing. Can it be done? My honest opinion is that Los Medanos should be encouraged to take on this challenging task, for no other community college is likely to provide a comparable level of leadership. The best predictor of future success is past success. I believe the students, faculty and administration at Los Medanos College have provided leadership for community colleges in the United States, and the proposed expansion of their activities may undergird a realistic rededication to the ideals of general education within the community college movement.

Sincerely,

Sanford M Dornbusch

Sanford M. Dornbusch

SMD/ms

cc: Charles Collins
Karl Drexel
John Porterfield
Chet Case

APPENDIX F

A STUDENT'S GUIDE TO HUMANISTIC STUDIES 2TG:

AN ETHICAL INQUIRY INTO SOCIETAL ISSUES

1. About the Course and the Los Medanos College General Education Program

Humanistic Studies 2TG, An Ethical Inquiry into Societal Issues, is an essential part of LMC's General Education program. In this course, you will look into important societal issues, using the information, concepts and generalizations, and tools of analysis from many fields of study as well as drawing on your experience and the experience of others. Further, you will have the opportunity to develop your skills in locating and reporting information as you study a topic of interest to you. This last activity is called the Self Directed Study (SDS) component. The "Ethical Inquiry" part of the course title signals that you will have the opportunity to probe into the ethical consequences of possible solutions to societal issues. Your ethics, those of others, and society's are all involved.

This course and the follow-on course, 3TG--Ethical Inquiry into a Selected Societal Issue--are intended to help you pull together your learnings and experiences from other General Education Courses. Humanistic Studies 2TG strives to involve you in the issues of the day and to show you how to keep informed on issues long after you leave the classroom. Humanistic Studies 2TG and 3TG are "capstone" courses, designed by a committee of faculty, students and administrators which worked on them for a year. LMC is justly proud of the results. The courses were offered first in 1978-79 and were thoroughly evaluated and refined during the year.

LMC is pleased to offer you this unique learning experience. You will be asked for your evaluation of the course at the end of the semester. Should you have suggestions, problems, or praise to deliver in the meantime, don't hesitate to speak to your instructor.

2. These are the goals of the course:

2.1 To provide an interdisciplinary study of selected issues of major importance.

2.2 To develop skills, knowledge, and attitudes necessary to promote self-directed and continued learning.

2.3 To investigate the assumptions beneath one's own and society's values.

2.4 To search out in societal issues and their alternative solutions the values components and to inquire into their ethical consequences.

3. Societal Issues:

A set of five important issues facing society was selected by a joint student/faculty committee. You can imagine the difficulty involved in narrowing the list of potential issues to the present five. The committee had its crystal ball in good working order, however, as the headlines of the day attest. It was a genuine thrill to realize that many LMC students began to explore the problems of energy in the Fall of 1978, a year before energy became the topic of an unprecedented Presidential address and the target of a massive national effort!

Each societal issue will be taken up in separate, but interconnected units of study. Here are the units and the broad questions to be considered in each.

3.1 Energy and Its Implication for Ecology

3.1.1 Is there an energy crisis?

3.1.2 If so, what are its dimensions and characteristics?

3.1.3 How does the production and use of energy affect the environment?

3.1.4 What are options for solution to the energy crisis?

3.1.5 What are the ethical consequences of the solutions?

3.2 Limits of Economic Growth

3.2.1 What is meant by economic growth?

3.2.2 What are the "facts" of economic growth, e.g., its historical origins, present state and rate, tools for measurement, relationship to resources and population, global impact?

3.2.3 Are there problems with economic growth?

3.2.4 If so, what are the solutions to the problems of economic growth? What are some relationships of energy and ecology to economic growth?

3.2.5 What ethical consequences are attached to the possible solutions?

3.3 Equality and Justice Between the Sexes

3.3.1 What are some definitions of equality and justice?

3.3.2 Is there a problem of inequality and injustice between the sexes?

3.3.3 What are the origins and present state of the problem? What is the extent of the problem?

3.3.4 What are some potential solutions?

3.3.5 What ethical consequences would result from each solution?

3.4 Equality and Justice Among Racial and Ethnic Groups

3.4.1 Is there a problem of inequality and injustice among racial and ethnic groups?

3.4.2 What are the origins and present state of the problem? What is the extent of the problem? How is the problem related to the problem of inequality and injustice between sexes?

3.4.3 What are some potential solutions?

3.4.4 What ethical consequences would follow from each solution?

3.5 A Search for a Basis for Ethics

3.5.1 What is the relationship of values to ethics?

3.5.2 What are values? How are they acquired? Do values change, for individuals and societies?

3.5.3 What is the present state of the problem? How is the question of values related to previous units?

4. Self Directed Study

4.1 Rationale

The most important thing to be learned in college is how to become a self-directed learner. A person learns this only by doing it. One has to experience the struggle of posing the questions, searching out information, putting what one learns into a meaningful structure and applying

the answers to one's behavior. This course, and its companion 3TG course, will involve each student in an effort of self-directed learning.

4.2 Procedures

Early in the semester each student will select a topic related to one of the five units which interests him/her. With the assistance of the instructor, the student will develop an outline, make a plan for reporting information, and practice useful information gathering skills such as interviewing, preparing questionnaire items, and critical reading. The student will be asked to consider the ethical or "fair-unfair", "right-wrong" aspects of the topic. How the topic is to be reported will be planned by the student and instructor.

5. Course Material and Expectations

5.1 Materials: Because this course deals with important issues of the moment, much of the material of the course will be collected from the media of the moment. Using current, everyday materials in addition to substantive articles enables the student to develop skill in the critical evaluation of information carried in newspapers, magazines, or on television. The materials are:

5.1.1 Syllabus: A collection of writings presenting viewpoints and information on the societal issues. Required.

5.1.2 Text: Energy & Environment: Four Energy Crises. Miller. Required.

5.1.3 Text: Limits of Growth. Available at Reserve Desk in Learning Resource Center or by purchase in the Bookstore.

5.1.4 Television and audio tapes, as assigned or recommended, will be available in the LRC.

5.2 Expectations Relating to Course Material

5.2.1 Students should read the assigned material prior to class and be prepared to participate in discussion.

5.2.2 Students should keep "tuned in" to the news media for background information.

5.2.3 As events develop and pertinent material becomes available, assignments in addition to the required syllabus and text may be made.

6. Calendar of the Course

	Weeks (approximately)
6.1 Sequence	
6.1.1 Overview and orientation	1
6.1.2 Energy and Implication for Ecology	3
6.1.3 The Limits of Economic Growth	3
6.1.4 Equality and Justice Between the Sexes	3
6.1.5 Equality and Justice Among Racial and Ethnic Groups	3
6.1.6 The Search for a Basis for Ethics	3
6.1.7 Review, course evaluation, final exam	1

6.2 Exams, Quizzes and Assignments

There will be an exam for each unit and a final exam covering the semester. Quizzes may be given at any time. Assignments will be made by the instructor.

6.3 Due Dates and Deadlines: (to be announced by the instructor)

a. Quizzes

b. Unit and final exam

c. Phases of the Self-Directed Study

d. Assignments

7. Policies

7.1 Attendance

7.1.1 Regular attendance and promptness of arrival are essential for success in this course. Classroom discussion, lecture, explanation, and exercises constitute a very large part of the class.

7.1.2 An instructor may drop a student whenever she/he feels the student's absences have irretrievably affected the students progress in the course. Three consecutive hours of absence or nine total hours of absence can result in the student being dropped.

7.1.3 Participation

7.2.1 Participation means involvement in the class activity through pre-class preparation and a readiness to learn.

7.2.2 Participation is essential in this course as it involves examining the values and ethics of society, others and self.

7.2.3 Participation requires the sharing of "air time", respect for the opinions and feelings of others and an agreement to make the classroom a forum for fair and free discussion.

8. Evaluation and Grading

Students will be evaluated on the basis of their ability to meet course objectives. Performance will be measured through periodic unit exams, a final examination, the self-directed study project, attendance and more subjective factors such as participation, involvement, commitment, etc. Final grades will be determined from the following total possible points:

Unit exams	100 points
Final examination	50 points
Self-directed study	100 points
Attendance	25 points
Other factors	25 points
TOTAL	300 points

The points will be translated into letter grades approximately as follows (some instructors may use a slightly different scale):

90 - 100% = A 80 - 89% = B 70 - 79% = C 60 - 69% = D Below 60% = F

An ordinary student with extraordinary effort can earn a B or even an A in this course. An ordinary student with only ordinary effort should expect to earn a C or D. Students should note that good grades depend to a considerable extent on taking all exams, completing the SDS project and attending regularly.

APPENDIX G

LOS MEDANOS COLLEGE
Professional Staff Development 197-4
Humanistic Studies 2TG

UNIT I

ENERGY: ITS FORMS, AVAILABILITY, AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR ECOLOGY

I. Assertion, delineation, and explication of a specific problem area: Meeting mankind's energy needs without imperiling man's environment.

A. Assertion of problem: Energy, the finite basis of man's physical existence, is being depleted at the same time that its increased exploitation is polluting the earth.

1. Pertinent questions to be addressed:

a. How big (extensive, important) is the problem? (Text, P. 2, 3, 8, 41 Ch. 8) (#1.)

b. How pressing is the problem? (#1.) (#2.)

c. How much energy is there? (Text, P. 3)

d. How fast is it being used? (Text, P. 5-8).

e. For what purpose is it being used? (#5, P. 37, 38)

f. What is the degree of pollution? (Text, P. 50ff.)

g. How is pollution related to energy use? (Text, P. 17, 18, P. 50 ff, Ch. 8)

h. What are the practical implications of waste and pollution? (Text, P. 28-30. P. 50ff)

i. What are the ethical implications of:

1. energy use and depletion

2. waste and pollution? (Text. P. 30, P. 50ff)

B. Basic concepts pertinent to the delineation of the problem.

1. Ecosystem (Text, P. 16, 18)

a. definition

(1. To what degree do we have any ethical right to seriously disrupt this balance?)

ENERGY: ITS FORMS, AVAILABILITY, AND
ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR ECOLOGY

b. Components (Text, P. 18ff)

1. abiotic

2. biotic

a. producers

b. consumers

c. decomposers

c. Characteristics: Must be cyclic to be self-sustaining. Energy only is non-cyclic. (Text, P. 12-14, P. 25ff).

1. Food chains and webs (Text, P. 26)

2. Ecosystems are dynamics (Text, P. 28ff)

2. Energy

a. Definition

b. Transformation of energy (Text P. 10-12)

1. thermodynamics: first law

2. thermodynamics: second law

a. Heat as the ultimate pollutant

3. implications of these laws

c. Ultimate source (Text, P. 16)

d. Major available forms

1. Consideration of varying quality and efficiency (Text. P. 32ff).

a. Importance of net energy concept (Text P. 33, 34)

b. Tabular evaluation of energy options - (Text. P. 38, 39)

2. Currently used

a. Fossil fuels (Text. Ch. 5)

1. description

a. finite quantity

2. acknowledged advantages

3. acknowledged limitations (#2.)

ENERGY: ITS FORMS, AVAILABILITY, AND
ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR ECOLOGY

4. controversial aspects

a. ethical issues involved.

b. Hydroelectric

1. description

2. acknowledged advantages

3. acknowledged limitations

4. controversial aspects

c. Nuclear fission (Text, Ch. 6)

1. description (Text. P. 40)

2. acknowledged advantages (Text P. 40)

3. acknowledged limitations (Text. P. 40 (#5, P. 40)

4. controversial aspects (Text P. 40)

a. ethical issues involved (Text P. 77)

3. Possible alternatives

a. Nuclear fusion (Text p. 82-85)

1. description

2. acknowledged advantages

3. acknowledged limitations

4. controversial aspects

(a. Ethical question: Are there limits to scientific experimentation?)

b. Wind (Text p. 87)

1. description

2. acknowledged advantages

3. acknowledged limitations

4. controversial aspects

c. Geothermal (Text P. 88)(#4, P. 28)

1. description

ENERGY: ITS FORMS, AVAILABILITY, AND
ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR ECOLOGY

2. acknowledged advantages
3. acknowledged limitations
4. controversial aspects

d. Solar (Text. p. 85-87) (#4, P. 28)
1. description
2. acknowledged advantages
3. acknowledged limitations
4. controversial aspects

e. Bio-mass (#4,p. 24-26)
1. description
2. acknowledged advantages
3. acknowledged limitations
4. controversial aspects (#3)

f. Hydrogen (Text P. 40.) (#4, P. 28)
1. description
2. acknowledged advantages
3. acknowledged limitations
4. controversial aspects

g. Conservation (Text. P. 89ff)
1. extent of unnecessary waste (Text, P. 89ff)
2. relation to pollution (Text. P. 56)
3. possibilities (#2, p. 5-7)
4. ethical issues involved

h. Soft energy path (#5)
1. description
2. acknowledged advantages
3. acknowledged limitations
4. controversial aspects

ENERGY: ITS FORMS, AVAILABILITY, AND
ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR ECOLOGY

(3) Distribution of supply

a. short term

b. long term

(1. What limits do we set on ourselves in securing supply?)

(4) Distribution of use (Text, p. 2, 5-8)

(5) Ethical issues involved in unequal distribution of supply and use.

4. Pollution of the biosphere

a. acknowledged facts

1. Heat as the ultimate pollutant (Text, Ch. 8)

b. controversial aspects

c. echical issues

5. Man's ecological niche (Text, P. 21)

a. cities are not self-sustaining (Text. p. 23, 24)

6. Relation of population to: (Text, p. 2, 3)

a. problem of energy use

b. problem of pollution ("popollution")

7. Summary: Inseparability of energy and ecology

a. Does the concept of cooperation with nature - as opposed to control of nature - involve an ethical consideration?

C. Confirmation: A Problem Exists.

ENERGY: ITS FORMS, AVAILABILITY, AND
ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR ECOLOGY

II. Possible responses to the problem (Text, Ch. 9)

A. Minimal response: A problem exists, but it has been over-dramatized.

1. A "doomsday" attitude is "in" today. Its popularity lacks substantial foundation.

2. We can be less wasteful of energy without significantly lowering our standard of living. (Text. p. 89ff. Text, Ch. 9)

(a. What ethical obligations do we have to future generations?)

3. Americans cannot and should not assume responsibility for other nations' problems.

a. Ethical issue involved.

4. America did not become a world leader by taking a negative, conservative stance.

a. Ethical issue involved: (In a threatening world can we afford to be weak?)

5. The problem is technological, and the answer will be technological.

a. Ethical issue involved in premise.

B. Maximal response: This world-wide problem is extremely grave and demands heroic measures by all, particularly by Americans. (#1. #2)

1. We are heading toward world-wide catastrophe. Time is running out. (#2, p. 3-5)

2. America cannot avoid involvement in this catastrophe. (Text, Ch. 8)

3. As the world's most profligate consumer of energy and polluter of the biosphere, America has an obvious obligation, reinforced by self interest, to lead efforts to avoid this catastrophe.

a. Ethical issue involved.

ENERGY: ITS FORMS, AVAILABILITY, AND
ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR ECOLOGY

4. This means radical conservation, even if our standard of living is adversely affected thereby. (Text, p. 89ff)

   (a. Ethical question: Can we impose a ceiling on the have-nots in our society? Should they be the exceptions?)

5. It means adoption of the "soft energy path" in all possible areas of energy use. (#5)

C. Measured response: The problem is real and threatening; but in resolving it we must take account of political and institutional, as well as physical, realities. (Text, Ch. 9)

1. Underdeveloped nations are not going to foreswear increased use of energy (and increased pollution) for our sake.

   (a. Ethical issue: Should we make them comply?)

2. On the other hand, one need not be a "prophet of doom" to see extremely grave danger ahead.

   a. Recap of the time table of depletion; of pollution.

3. But for Americans, the perils of "too little too late" must be weighed against the perils of sweeping, precipitate offical action for which the public is unprepared.

   a. We must change by "phases."

4. The most urgent present need is for education and the mobilization of public opinion. (#1, p. 3)

   a. We have already made notable progress in this direction. (Text, P. 102)

   b. This is the reason for examining this issue here.

   c. Our government - both the Executive and Congress - is to be faulted for not giving this issue higher priority and greater exposure, thus accelerating our education. (Text, Ch.9) (#2, p. 7)

1. is our government too much under the "hard energy" influence of vested interests? (#2, p. 6)

5. The most viable answer will be found in some combination of "hard" and "soft" energy, with major emphasis on reasonable conservation. (Text. p. 89ff)

III. Summary of ethical implications

IV. The energy problem and me

A. What is my choice of responses?
Do I have a still different response?

B. What can I do to alleviate the problem? (Text, p. 109)

C. What do I choose to do in the matter?

D. What negatave consequences am I willing to accept?

APPENDIX H

A DESCRIPTION OF THE COMMUNITY, THE STUDENT BODY
THE COLLEGE AND THE FACULTY
OF LOS MEDANOS COLLEGE

A. The Community

Los Medanos College is located on the boundary between the towns of Pittsburg and Antioch and serves the eastern portion of California's Contra Costa County. The weather and agriculture of this area relate it to the Sacramento Valley but the orientation of the industry and the allegiance of the people is directed toward the San Francisco Bay Area. Within a five mile arc from the college there are many multi-million dollar industrial complexes, the most notable being U.S. Steel, Union Carbide, Dow Chemical, Dupont, Fibreboard and Crown Zellerbach. They contribute heavily to the property tax which pays approximately 40 percent of all college costs.

There are really three sub-communities within the Los Medanos College (LMC) area. There are the farm communities of the east, the industrial, blue-collar communities of Pittsburg and Antioch, and the outreaches of suburbia in Concord and Walnut Creek. There are marked differences among these sub-communities even though the social class range is no broader than lower-lower to middle-middle. There are notable ethnic differences as well. The Blacks are centered in Pittsburg, the Chicanos in the eastern agricultural region and the Whites in Antioch, Concord and Walnut Creek.

As might be surmised from the above, radical variations exist in the levels of education and sophistication of the people in the area. None of this is mentioned as an educator's complaint, but rather to provide a benchmark from which to measure the progress of students toward understanding the great societal issues and the ethical choices that follow from each of them.

This is the major goal of the Los Medanos College general education model. Such a goal for such a student population reflects the faith of the college in the democratic assumption of the competence of average people to understand complex issues, to make ethical judgments, and to deserve a voice in guiding their society's destiny. If this assumption is false, then the whole democratic edifice is built on a hollow underpinning.

B. The Student Body

Los Medanos College is small relative to many community colleges. In its sixth year of operation (1979-80) it had a total enrollment of just over 5,000 students. There are almost as many women enrolled as men. Actually there were more women than men in the day classes. The median age of Los Medanos College students ranges consistently around 28. About 23 percent of the students come from minority cultures with the racial breakout being 9 percent Black, 1 percent Native People, 1 percent Asian and 12 percent Chicano. The fact that only 15 percent of the students carry 12 or more units reflects that many students are too busy working for money to carry a full load. The result of this is that many, if not most, students attend for more than the traditional two years.

With its open admissions policy the college serves students drawn from all levels of sophistication in the service area. This again suggests that if it can be demonstrated that these students can effectively grapple with the societal issues with which they are faced, then it follows that what can be done here can also be done elsewhere--that the model would be exportable.

C. The College

Los Medanos College is one of the 103 public community colleges in California. In this state, as in the nation, the community college population is the largest group within higher education. LMC is the youngest and smallest of three colleges developed within Contra Costa Community College District.

As is true of all California community colleges, the doors of Los Medanos College are open tuition-free to any resident high school graduate or to any resident over 18 years old who can profit from instruction. There are only exit requirements for institutional endorsement, and no entrance tests for admission or for placement in academic tracks. To secure the institutional endorsement of an associate in arts degree, the student is required to have a C average or better in 60 units, to have met the highly structured 26-unit general education requirement, to have a minimum 18-unit major, to have 2 units of physical education and to have met the proficiency requirement in reading, composition and mathematics. The academic functions of the college are general education, transfer education, career education and continuing education or professional up-grading. The central function is general education since it is the core of everything else.

D. The Faculty

The college regards itself, and is regarded by others (e.g., the Accreditation Team from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges) as having an excellent and unusual faculty - unusual in commitment, in diversity, and in ethnic and sexual balance. About half of the instructors are women and 30 percent represent minority ethnic backgrounds. Age is bi-modal; teachers who transferred from sister colleges in the District are around age 50 years or older, while new teachers are in their 20's and 30's. Most of the latter, while already well qualified otherwise, came to the college with little or no prior teaching experience. It was possible successfully to engage inexperienced teachers (about half of the total faculty) because the college has its own unique program for the induction and professional development of instructors.

The program was headed by a Professional Development Facilitator, Dr. Chester H. Case, who played a key role in the preparation of faculty to under-

take this new feature of the General Education Program. The demonstrated success of the program to date has satisfied the college that participating instructors can, through it, and with the assistance of specialist consultants, become proficient in handling the challenging task of conducting ethical inquiry into societal issues.

Over half of the contract faculty of 60 are instructors in general education courses. All of these, in addition to a few others, have engaged in a significant way in the final stages of translating the plans into the actual new courses whose implementation is the content of this report.

APPENDIX I

REPORT OF OUTSIDE EVALUATORS ON THE GENERAL EDUCATION SOCIETAL ISSUES PROJECT AT LOS MEDANOS COLLEGE

Karl O. Drexel
John H. Porterfield
March 10, 1980

Over the past 18 months the Los Medanos College project, "To Establish Ethical Inquiry Into Today's Major Societal Issues As A General Education Requirement In A Community College," has received both formative and summative evaluation. The focus of assessment has been the extent to which the goals set forth in the college's grant application to the National Foundation For The Humanities in April, 1978 are being achieved.

GOALS ON WHICH EVALUATION IS BASED

These goals are:

1. To make students aware of survival issues;
2. To inquire into the ethical implications of knowledge, particularly as applied to societal issues;
3. To develop in students a world view;
4. To aid students to progress toward intellectual autonomy through self-directed study; and
5. To bring a distinctively humanistic orientation to the whole general education program.

In addition to these central goals the college had certain concomitant ones in mind which the evaluators also took into consideration. Prominent among these related goals are:

6. To demonstrate the validity and importance of an interdisciplinary approach to general education, and the possibility of successfully employing it;
7. To enhance the appeal of general education to students, who have characteristically regarded it only as a hurdle to be overcome in their progress toward occupational specialization;
8. To intensify the coherence of the local general education structure which is conceived in three levels:

Level 1. "Discipline" courses, which stress basic information in each of six "fields" of knowledge and relate it to other courses in the same field.

Level 2. Interdisciplinary "Societal Issues" courses which bring insight from all fields to bear on current social problems.

Level 3. Intensified study of one issue under the instruction of a specialist in the field.

The project is concerned with levels 2 and 3, and the evaluators have considered only them. Of necessity, other related goals - such as increasing the impact of general education on the whole college curriculum and on practices in other colleges - must await developments, and are not considered in this evaluation. Evaluation attention, accordingly has focused on the extent to which eight goals have been or are being achieved.

EVALUATION DEVICES AND PROCEDURES

A variety of devices were employed by the evaluators in assessing the success of the project. Some were formal and to some extent quantifiable, others were less formal, based on observations and impressions of the evaluators and others involved.

The formal instruments were two questionnaires responded to by all students in these courses over the three semesters they have been offered. One was a document (Appendix D) prepared by the evaluators and teaching staff, calling for both forced-choice and free-comment responses. The other was a 39 item "IDEA Survey Form - Student Reactions to Instructors and Courses" (Appendix D). This forced-choice form is prepared and given computerized treatment by the Center For Faculty Evaluation And Development In Higher Education located in Manhattan, Kansas. The responses to both of these forms lend themselves to some statistical treatment.

A less formal device was the instructor opinionnaire (Appendices D3 and D4) responded to by all of the faculty teaching the General Education Societal Issues courses. By means of if they registered their estimates of the successes, problems and prospects for these courses. In addition to these instruments, the evaluators interviewed all of the involved faculty; visited many classes; attended most of the weekly

and periodic meetings of this staff; attended all meetings of the General Education Societal Issues Committee, which has general oversight of the courses; reported to the interim evaluative retreat of the involved staff in the spring of 1979; and interviewed the involved college administrators.

PROGRESS TOWARD GOAL ACHIEVEMENT

GOAL 1: To Awaken Heightened Awareness Of The Seriousness Of Survival Issues.

During each of the three project semesters, students responded to five items bearing on this goal. A significantly high percentage responded positively. Over the 3 semesters, 84% to 92% said that, as a result of taking the course they were now better informed on the issues; 64% to 73% said that they were more interested in all of the issues; 80% to 85% reported that they were more interested in at least one of the issues; 85% to 96% stated that they were more aware of the seriousness of at least one of the issues. Typical "free-comments" were: "Before I took this course I only had a general understanding of these topics. This course really dwelled on these topics".... "It is really a very informative and eye-opening course dealing with very serious issues".... "I really never cared about it before but I do now".... "This is definitely true, and this course has opened up a new interest that I want to pursue."

Responses as positive as this - significantly higher than 2 out of 3 in most cases - would be considered encouraging for most classes in any subject. The evaluators regard the rating as particularly noteworthy because most students, by their own statement, took the course only because it was required.

Faculty assessment of success in achieving this goal was somewhat more conservative, but all agreed that the course succeeded in this respect either "surprisingly well" or "reasonably well." This relative reticence on the fact of instructors is typical and understandable, and is regarded by the evaluators as a reflection of conscientious concern rather than as an expression of basic doubt about the success of their efforts. This observation is strongly supported by impressions gained

through three semesters of on-going contact with this faculty, and it likewise applies to any differences in student and faculty perceptions about the achievement of the other goals.

GOAL 2: To Approach The Examination Of Pressing Societal Issues, And Their Resolution, Through The Process Of Ethical Inquiry.

The evaluators are aware that attempting this goal is so fraught with risk and difficulty that the attempt is conspicuous by its rarity in higher education. Awakening moral response without resorting to overt moralizing was recognized by the faculty as a major challenge in the course. Student responses in this area indicate an impressive degree of success. Over the three semesters, 67% to 75% of the respondents acknowledged that the course "looked into the ethical aspects of choices for action" without under- or over-emphasis. Seventy-seven percent to 84% noted that they had "a clearer idea of the ethical considerations involved in at least one of the issues (they) studied than (they) had before taking this course." Sixty-eight percent to 74% reported that they have examined their values more carefully since taking this course.

Typical student comments are illuminating. "Quite honestly, I've discovered values I never knew I had before this course".... "We studied all kinds of different values, and this made me look closer at mine".... "I've learned that ethical considerations include the well-being of other people and not just myself. This new view has caused me to change some of my values".... "This course was better than I expected. It was done well".... "I finally understand 'ethical' - it took all semester".... "The class made me stop and think."

A category in the IDEA Survey Form supports these findings. Over the three semesters the course received a rating of from "high average" (top 30%) to "high" (top 10%) on the item "Discovering the implications of the course material for understanding myself (interests, talents, values, etc.)"

The instructors were somewhat more reserved in their judgment. A minority said the goal had been achieved "surprisingly well," more responded "reasonably well" and two said that the results were "not disappointing, but not really reassuring, either."

They noted that the goal was exceptionally difficult to achieve and hard to evaluate. These observations were made in the first project semester, before the student responses were canvassed. Optimism increased during the course of the project.

GOAL 3: To Encourage Students With A Parochial Outlook To Develop A More Adequately Informed World View.

This is the most difficult of all of the goals on which to evaluate degree of achievement. No item on the student survey document referred to it directly. However, since all issues were presented in a world - as well as a national - context, an encouraging inference can be drawn from the positive response (84% to 92%) to the item, "I am better informed on all of the issues we have studied than I was before I took this course." It has been found necessary to install a large map of the world in the classroom, because student ignorance of world geography is pervasive. But even in the absence of a clear "world view" by students there is an encouraging indication, in their comments on their changing values, that this course has inclined many to be less self-centered than previously.

The instructors were ambivalent on the degree of their success in this effort. One reported that the course succeeded "surprisingly well," five checked "reasonably well," there were three estimates of "neither disappointing nor reassuring," and one responded "little or no progress." There was some uncertainty as to what was meant by the term, "world view." The current addition of "the problem of population growth" to one unit should remove some of this uncertainty and enhance students' global perspective.

GOAL 4: To Encourage Students To Progress Toward Intellectual Autonomy Through Instructor-Assisted Independent Study.

Because the general aversion of community college students to self-directed study has often been noted and has been experienced locally, the instructors and evaluators alike regarded the emphasis (one-third of the grade) placed on this aspect of the new courses to be as risky as it was imperative. And indeed it has proved to be, for stu-

dents and instructors alike, a major burden. But the student response has been surprising. Over the three project semesters, from 55% (first semester) to 70% (last semester) of the students reported that "Self-Directed Study has been a good learning experience." From 57% to 72% said that the emphasis placed on SDS was "about right," and from 60% to 69% indicated that they expected the acquired skills to be useful later. The growing acceptance of this element may be due in great part to the revised procedure whereby the project is now divided into three stages and spread evenly over the semester.

Student comments on SDS were as graphic as were the percentages noted. Typical comments on the benefits received from SDS were: "Learning research skills. I found things in the library I didn't know existed".... "Being able to take the responsibility for doing a research paper that required a lot of hard work. It was a very worthwhile learning experience".... "It taught me, or gave me a better awareness of what I can do for myself in learning things that are vital for me to learn as a human being".... "I have changed my tune about the topic of my choice".... "learning how to find things out for yourself".... "It gave me an opportunity to do my own thing. I felt great!" Asked to suggest how to improve SDS, 27% said, "It can't be improved;" (very few said, "Drop it.")

Enthusiasm for independent study is by no means universal among the students in these courses, but the evidence of wide acceptance is as encouraging as it is surprising.

Instructors reported that their attention to SDS was the most difficult and time consuming, as well as probably the most important, aspect of their responsibility. Typical instructor comments were: "I am very enthusiastic about the success of the course, particularly the self-directed study".... "The change we made in the handling of self-directed study made three times as much work for both teachers and students, but it was worth it".... "Self-directed study has improved immensely during these three semesters. This is evidence that the faculty is committed to standards and is willing to work harder accordingly".... "I am very pleased to note that students

react positively to SDS. It is considerably more work for faculty and students but is eminently worthwhile."

GOAL 5: To Bring A More Emphatically Humanistic Emphasis To The Whole General Education Program.

Examination of the content of the courses Humanistic Studies 2TG and 3TG reveals immediately their central concern with the human condition and with human values. No measuring devices were employed by the evaluators to gauge directly and comprehensively the degree of achievement of Goal 5, but the notably positive responses to items referred to above ("I am more interested in all of the issues studied;" "I have a clearer idea of the ethical considerations involved;" "I have in some degree changed my attitude regarding at least one of the issues studied;" "I have examined my values more carefully since I have taken this course;") all these lead the evaluators to the conclusion that this goal is being achieved indirectly if not directly to a commendable and encouraging degree. This conclusion is reinforced by examining the comments volunteered by students. Such comments as the following were numerous: "My values where prejudice and racism are concerned have changed drastically, much to my surprise".... "A chief benefit from the course is that it gave me a chance to look at the problems, issues and inequalities of our society".... "A top benefit was learning about subjects that affect my every day life or the lives of others".... "This course has changed my attitude towards certain problems, giving me an incentive to be less careless and more aware of the needs of our society".... "I was able to reexamine my values and make some important changes in my attitudes."

Instructors for these courses were drawn from a variety of disciplines, and when asked what impact this experience might have on their teaching of other classes, some replied in humanistic terms. Science teachers spoke of giving "values" more prominence in their teaching (even in "hard core" science classes) and one recommended that other science instructors share this experience for this reason. Related to this response was expression of increased concern for such ethical matters as "justice." It was

noted that instructor experience with this subject should encourage ethical emphasis in all teaching, broaden one's education, encourage inclusion of humanistic elements in the interdisciplinary approach, and counteract the tendency to "narrow down" courses. From a variety of perspectives it would appear that the college can be assured that encouraging progress is being made toward achieving the fifth goal.

GOAL 6: To Demonstrate The Possibility Of Successfully Employing An Interdisciplinary Approach In General Education.

The validity and value of interdisciplinary education has been widely and persistently acclaimed, but attempts to practice it have characteristically foundered on the rock of faculty reluctance to hazard the insecurity of teaching outside of the field of their specialization. And although this college has emphasized generalized background in the selection of many of its instructors, nothing was more obvious to the evaluators in the early months of this project than the anxiety of all of the instructors as they approached subject matter that was unfamiliar to them.

That this anxiety has been effectively reduced is obvious, even though it may not ever be completely overcome. Students recognized approvingly the interdisciplinary nature of the instruction they were receiving. Asked to respond to the statement, "This course uses information from many fields of knowledge," 75% to 84% in the successive classes answered affirmatively, adding such comments as "Indeed it does;".... "Very good variety;".... "That's what's good about it, because it doesn't just take one aspect of it."

Instructor expressions, of course, were even more significant. Without exception, in their first semesters, the teachers listed "overcoming anxiety" among the three greatest difficulties encountered. Consistently this concern received less emphasis in succeeding semesters. Asked this semester to respond to the question, "How will the teaching of this course affect your teaching in other courses?" a science instructor asserted, "I honestly believe I can now teach almost anything."

The evidence persuades the evaluators that such a remarkable and striking transformation was largely a result of the interaction of four factors:

1. The participants took this risk voluntarily. Their dedication was noteworthy.

2. They were very good teachers to begin with. Almost all ranked generally "high" (top 10%) or "high average" (top 30%) on the IDEA Survey Form.

3. The faculty worked closely together, meeting weekly during the first two semesters and frequently thereafter, to share experiences and problems, take advantage of each other's expertise, and to generally reassure each other. In the words of one participant, "We had to hang together or we would hang separately." Partly as a result of this experience the group developed observably high morale. It became a "faculty within the faculty" of the college.

4. Most significant of all is the amount of inservice training, led by a well-qualified Professional Development Facilitator, that the group continues to experience. The General Education Societal Issues faculty is now divided into four categories, and professional development activities are now being conducted for them on local district funds.

   a. New recruits devote two hours a week to seminars in which they become acquainted with the content in the various units of the course. Veteran instructors lead most of these discussions. Some participants will, and some may not, teach the course in time to come.

   b. Those who have passed through this experience engage two hours weekly in seminars devoted to pedagogy appropriate to the course. The facilitator plays a more prominent role in these seminars, but the veteran instructors are still center stage.

   c. Following this experience, instructors are ready to teach the first-level course, Humanistic Studies 2TG, adding to the faculty or replacing teachers who have dropped out or taken leave. This group meets less frequently but some members meet with the first two groups in the role of mentors or advisors.

   d. After teaching at the 2TG level, some instructors elect to teach a Humanistic Studies 3TG course. This group meets less frequently and less regularly.

In the judgment of the evaluators this is an appropriately designed program in staff development which may account, in significant measure, for the fact that instructors from disparate disciplines can come together, confront unfamiliar subject matter, and present an interdisciplinary course which is gaining recognition as one of the most important offerings in the catalog.

GOAL 7: To Enhance The Attractiveness Of General Education To Students.

Humanistic Studies 2TG, and its 3TG sequel, are required for graduation, and in the past most students have said that they took these courses for this reason alone. But there is indication that this attitude is changing. This semester 61% of the 2TG students and 84% of those in 3TG responded positively to the statement, "As a result of taking this course, I have more positive feelings toward this field of study." In response to the question, "Would a student benefit from taking both Humanistic Studies 2TG and 3TG even if they were not required?" 47% of the 3TG students now respond, "Yes, definitely," and another 47% say, "Probably so." And to the question, "Would you recommend this course to a friend?" 55% of these same students replied, "Yes, definitely" and another 22% said, "Yes, with reservations." One student commented, "I have already done so to several."

It will be important to discover whether this attitude predicts a trend. If so, it would be a matter of great and broad significance.

GOAL 8: To Intensify The Coherence Of The Entire General Education Program Of The College.

To the extent that the General Education Societal Issues courses are accomplishing their other goals and gaining prestige and acceptance, they achieve goal 8 and lend distinctive character to the entire program. They are conceived as "capstone" courses, and when the approach, principles and methods that distinguish them are infused into the basic "discipline" courses identified by the general education label, the entire program should exhibit the desired coherence. Until this is done, however, the well-conceived program will be deficient in coherence and balance, as will be noted in the final section of this report.

SUMMARY EVALUATION: PRESENT STATUS OF THE GENERAL EDUCATION SOCIETAL ISSUES COURSES

About 700 students have experienced Humanistic Studies 2TG and another 210 are currently registered. Approximately one-fifth of that total number have taken or are taking 3TG, the second level of the two-tier sequence. B, all of the measures,

formal and informal, that have been used to assess the acceptance of the project and the achievement of its goals, the record of success to date is impressive. This record stands out in heightened relief when consideration is given to the formidable difficulties faced, especially 1) the normal student resistance to self-directed study, 2) the hazards and difficulties inherent in the unfamiliar pedagogical approach of ethical inquiry, and 3) the very spotty record achieved to date by attempts at interdisciplinary instruction in higher education.

This success is attributed to a number of interrelated factors, of which the following stand out:

1. The "relevancy" of the subject matter, concerned with problems prominent in the daily news; more still, to
2. the careful planning, bolstered by adequate resources, that was invested in the design of these courses and the preparation for their presentation; and, most of all, to
3. high quality instruction by enthusiastic teachers.

CONCERNS FOR THE FUTURE

To capitalize fully on the momentum of an auspicious beginning, the college will wish to give consideration to the following matters, among others, relative to the General Education Societal Issues program.

1. Humanistic Studies 2TG is currently the showpiece of the general education program. But 2TG is only one of the three "levels" of which the whole program consists, and the three are out of balance.
   a. The first level - the "discipline" courses - should receive prompt attention. Since they are not included in the current project, the evaluators have given them only superficial examination, but this cursory study has shown that they do not fit into the picture as they should. The program is a structure whose foundation needs strengthening.
   b. The 3TG level also needs attention. These courses are well-received by those who take them but too few do so. Professional Development efforts have focused on 2TG, and the upper level has been a somewhat peripheral

concern. In the interest of program symmetry and integrity, this deficiency should be corrected.

2. Considering the obvious dependence of the success of these courses upon the factor of superior teaching, these recommendations are in order:

   a. The college should continue to exercise care that only carefully selected, adequately prepared teachers are entrusted with these classes.

   b. The seminars should be maintained for induction of new instructors and provision should be made for keeping the whole instructional cadre in close touch with each other. The importance of this provision cannot be over-stressed.

   c. Instructors must not be "burned out". Instructing these classes is difficult, time-consuming, sometimes exhausting work, and every resource available to the college (such as the special assistance in writing now offered to students for SDS) should be used to lighten the load. When indicated and feasible, teachers might even drop out for a semester to "recharge".

3. The experience of teaching this course would be a positive one for any receptive instructor and would be of benefit to the college. The institutional intention to expand participation should produce positive results.

4. Perhaps most important of all, every effort must be made to maintain the integrity and momentum of this program. Attention should focus on the necessity of continuous leadership, possibly through some joint faculty-administration structure. The excellent concept that has now been given substance will not maintain itself without structured overseeing and guidance. The superb effort, now well-launched, must be maintained and enhanced.

APPENDIX J

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR HUMANITIES

PROGRAM EXPENDITURE REPORT

As of December 31, 1979

CATAGORY		ORIGINAL BUDGET	EXPENSES As of 6/30/79	2/29/80 EXPENSES 79-80	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	12/31/79 AVAILABLE BALANCE
Instructional Staff	07012	$38,494.00	$18,635.64	$12,479.95	$31,115.59	
Health & Welfare	30012	-	226.53	-	226.53	
Unemploy. Insurance	40012	77.00	37 60	24.96	62.56	
Workman's Comp.	50012	309.00	147.59	98.60	246.19	
Supplies/Misc.	08389	-	641.97	-	641.97	
Outside Eval./ Consultants	096 6	11,120.00	14,846.81	2,448.00	17,294.81	
Total		$50,000.00	$34,536.14	$15,051.51	$49,587.65	$412.35

Prepared By

Director of Business Services
Los Medanos College

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR HUMANITIES

PROGRAM EXPENDITURE REPORT

As of December 31, 1979

CATAGORY		ORIGINAL BUDGET	EXPENSES As of 6/30/79	2/29/80 EXPENSES 79-80	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	12/31/79 AVAILABLE BALANCE
Instructional Staff	07012	$38,494.00	$18,635.64	$12,479.95	$31,115.59	
Health & Welfare	30012	-	226.53	-	226.53	
Unemploy. Insurance	40012	77.00	37.60	24.96	62.56	
Workman's Comp.	50012	309.00	147.59	98.60	246.19	
Supplies/Misc.	08389	-	641.97	-	641.97	
Outside Eval./ Consultants	09626	11,120.00	14,846.81	2,448.00	17,294.81	
Total		$50,000.00	$34,536.14	$15,051.51	$49,587.65	$412.35

Prepared By

Director of Business Services
Los Medanos College

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
96 POWELL LIBRARY BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
EE 36

120

SEP 3 1982